



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-063
Tuesday
2 April 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-063

CONTENTS

2 April 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General Lobov Comments on Warsaw Pact's End [TASS]	1
Delegate Assesses Vienna Talks [Moscow TV]	1
U.S. Seen as Uncompromising on CFE [Moscow International]	1
U.S. Questions Soviet Compliance on Disarmament [Moscow International]	2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO Military Structures Should Disband [TASS]	3
'World This Week' Discusses Japan Relations [Moscow Radio]	3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Calls for Review of USSR-U.S. Ties Viewed [PRAVDA 29 Mar]	8
---	---

China

Bessmertnykh's Visit to Beijing Reported	9
Commentary Previews Visit [Moscow International]	9
Arrives 31 Mar [TASS]	9
Meets PRC Counterpart [TASS]	10
Meets Chinese Premier [PRAVDA 2 Apr]	10
Departs 2 Apr [TASS]	10
Chinese Coverage Noted [cross-reference]	11

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to Japan Previewed	11
Seen as 'Truly Historic' [TASS]	11
TASS Notes Preparations	11
Science, Technology Treaties Signed With DPRK	12
New Level of Cooperation Expected [Moscow International]	12
Officials Interviewed [Moscow International]	12
ROK General's Appointment to UN Command Cited [PRAVDA 28 Mar]	13
Conference on Asian Security Planned in Jun [TASS]	13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Malaysian Proposal for Economic Bloc Assessed [Moscow International]	13
Malaysian Official Considers Soviet ASEAN Role [Moscow International]	14
Manila's Economic Development Plan Assessed [Moscow International]	14
U.S. Bases Issue in Philippines Still Unresolved [Moscow International]	14
Philippine Official on Soviet Use of Subic Bay [Moscow TV]	15

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Examines Arab-Israeli Conflict	15
Part I [21 Mar]	15
Part II [22 Mar]	16

Kurdish 'Rebel' Interviewed on Fighting in Iraq [Moscow TV]	19
UN Security Council Talks on Gulf Reviewed [TASS]	19
Afghan Commander Cites Pakistani 'Interference' [Moscow Radio]	20

East Europe

General Views East Europe Troop Withdrawals [TASS]	20
Hungarian Officials View Soviet Relations	21
Premier Speaks on Regional Ties [PRAVDA 29 Mar]	21
Minister Holds News Conference [Budapest MTI]	21
State Assembly Official Speaks [Moscow Radio]	21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Resolution Urges S. Ossetia State of Emergency [PRAVDA 2 Apr]	23
TASS Reports Supreme Soviet Proceedings 1 Apr	23
All Treaties With Germany Ratified	23
New Government Structure Approved	24

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens Agro-Industrial Meeting 26 Mar [Moscow TV]	24
Gorbachev's Closing Remarks [Moscow TV]	25
PRAVDA Version of Remarks [30 Mar]	29
Gorbachev Examines Work on Anti-Crisis Program [TASS]	33
Pavlov Addresses Automobile Workers 1 Apr [Moscow Radio]	33
Further on Pavlov Factory Visit [Moscow TV]	33
Further on Pugo Remarks on 28 Mar Rally [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Apr]	34
Shevardnadze Rejects 28 Mar Military Presence [Moscow TV]	35
Shevardnadze Reiterates Dictatorship Warning [PRAVDA 1 Apr]	35
Law on Cabinet of Ministers Published [IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]	35
Decree Enacting Law [IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]	41

Economic

Orders To Cut Illegal Goods Turnover Issued [PRAVDA 2 Apr]	42
PRAVDA Cites Gorbachev Message on Prices [1 Apr]	42
Senchagov on Price Reform, Gorbachev Letter [Moscow TV]	42
March Inflation Rate up 3.5 Percent [Moscow International]	43
Psychological Barriers to Market Economy Persist [IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]	43
Pavlov Begins Hearing Miners' Grievances [TASS]	44
11 Vorkuta Mines on Strike; Losses Mount [Moscow Radio]	44
Further Details on Coal Strike Situation [TASS]	44
Pit Strikes Hit Railroad Workers, Steelmen [PRAVDA 29 Mar]	45
Power Struggle Seen Behind Kuzbass Strikes [PRAVDA 28 Mar]	45
Semipalatinsk Test Site Conversion Authorized [Moscow International]	48
Karpov Cited on Conversion Process [Moscow International]	48
Munitions Plant Switches to Medical Research [Moscow International]	49

Agriculture

Spring Sowing Campaign Facing Seed Shortage [PRAVDA 28 Mar]	49
Weather, State of Crops in Early March Reported [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Mar]	49

Scientific

'Automatic Space Station' Launched 31 Mar [TASS]	50
Progress M-7 Docking Difficulties Detailed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar]	50

Military

Gorbachev Addresses Army Party Conference [TASS]	51
Yazov Speech to All-Army Party Conference [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Apr]	52

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Security Chief Warns of Second Coup [IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]	55
Officials Preview Soviet-Lithuanian Talks [TASS]	55
Lithuania Communique on Simenas 'Disappearance' [IZVESTIYA 26 Mar]	55
Canada's 'De Jure' Recognition of Latvia Cited [TASS]	56
Estonian Komsomol Drops Lenin, Communist Tags [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Mar]	56

RSFSR

Moscow Mayor Urges Lifting Ban on Rallies [TASS]	56
Text of Gorbachev Decree on Moscow MVD Body [IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]	56
Moscow MVD Chief Shilov Interviewed [IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]	57
Russian Referendum, Poll Results Published [PRAVDA 26 Mar]	57
RSFSR Amends Decision on Retail Prices [Moscow Radio]	58
'State of Emergency' Until 1 Jul in Lipetsk [Radio Rossii]	58
Kuzbass Strike Leader Addresses 29 Mar Congress [IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]	58
'Confrontation' Marks 30 Mar Congress Debate [PRAVDA 1 Apr]	58
Comparison of Yeltsin 29 Mar Speech to Congress [Moscow TV]	61

RSFSR Congress 31 Mar

Deputies Continue Debate Over Russian Situation	61
Morning Debate on Yeltsin Report [TASS]	61
Deputies' Opposing Views on Report [TASS]	62
Evening Debate on Yeltsin Report [TASS]	62
Yeltsin Speaks on 'Blackmail,' 'Threats' [Moscow Radio]	63
North Ossetian Minister Addresses Congress [TASS]	63
RSFSR Congress Resolution on South Ossetia [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Apr]	63
Sobchak Addresses RSFSR Congress [Moscow TV]	64
Isakov Urges 'Constructive Centrism' [TASS]	65
Kuzbass Miners' Representative Speaks at Congress [Moscow TV]	66
General Volkogonov Addresses RSFSR Deputies [Moscow TV]	66
Passions 'Flying High' at 31 Mar Session [TASS]	68
Moscow TV Coverage of 31 Mar Proceedings	68

RSFSR Congress 1 Apr

Moscow TV Coverage Details Proceedings	72
Congress Continues To Debate Russian Presidency	76
Adjourns Over Vote Deadlock [TASS]	76
Moscow Radio on 'Stormy Debate'	76
Ways To Resolve Issue Sought [TASS]	77
Radio Rossii on 'Impasse'	77
Issue Left Undecided [TASS]	78
Khasbulatov Addresses Congress on Union Treaty [TASS]	78
TASS Interviews Deputy Gocharov on Congress	79

Caucasus

Georgian Leader Sends Gorbachev Letter on Crisis [TASS]	79
Reports of Continued Violence in South Ossetia	79
'Firearms,' 'Rockets' Used [Moscow Radio]	79
Shooting in Tskhinvali 31 Mar [Tbilisi Radio]	80
Georgians Continue Shelling [TASS]	80

Further Reportage on Georgian Referendum Voting	80
Vremya Accused of 'Distortion' [Tbilisi Radio]	80
'Vast Majority' Favor Independence [TASS]	80
TASS Reports Results	81
Azerbaijan PF Claims Referendum Irregularities [IZVESTIYA 28 Mar]	81

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Speech to Miners Reported [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Mar]	81
Kazakhstan, USSR Ministry Sign Rail Agreement [Moscow Radio]	82
Kazakhstan Moves To Improve Food Output [TASS]	82
Various Kazakh Legislation Published [cross-references]	83
Law on Price Formation	83
Law on Banks, Banking Activities	83
Legislation on Ownership	83
Law on Freedom of Economic Activity	83
Draft Law on Enterprise Taxation	83
Uzbekistan Abolishes Tax on Essential Goods [Moscow Radio]	83

General Lobov Comments on Warsaw Pact's End
*LD3103143391 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0925 GMT 31 Mar 91*

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Mar (TASS)— The activities of the military structures of the Warsaw Pact [WP] have ceased as from today. Army General Petr Lushev, commander in chief of Combined Armed Forces (CAF), and the CAF chief of staff, Army General Vladimir Lobov have laid down their powers as military leaders of the WP.

In connection with the cancellation of the military agreements concluded earlier within the framework of the WP, Vladimir Lobov, in a TASS interview, nevertheless expressed the hope that the former allies will continue their cooperation in new forms for the purposes of "the further development of goodneighborly relations".

In the opinion of Vladimir Lobov, the decision of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact to abolish its military structures by no means signifies that they must automatically cease to be partners. "I hope our relations will develop, above all, on a bilateral basis, including matters of security and military-technical cooperation", said Vladimir Lobov. The decision to abolish the military bodies and structures of the WP by 31 March 1991 was made at an extraordinary conference of the Political Consultative Committee held in Budapest in February of this year. In accordance with that decision, the organization has abolished its Defense Ministers' Committee, Joint Command, Military Council, and Military Scientific and Technical Council. The staff of the missions of the WP commander in chief attached to the national defense ministries have been recalled.

Vladimir Lobov noted that the decision was made possible by the lowering of the level of East-West military confrontation. "Only in this situation did it become feasible to set about creating a new model of general European security and chart ways of effecting a consistent transition to a nonbloc structure", said the general. He feels that this "opens the prospect of consistently transforming the military-political alliances into political ones and doing away with the blocs entirely".

Delegate Assesses Vienna Talks

*OW2903091491 Moscow Central Television First
Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT
28 Mar 91*

[From the "Utro 120 + 30" program]

[Text] The second round of the new stage of talks on conventional armed forces in Europe has ended in Vienna. Here is our report:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] What was done at this Vienna-2 round?

[Grinevskiy] First, we agreed on the format for exchanging information on military forces and the basic categories of arms and equipment in Europe. Second, preparations for a seminar on military doctrines in which the chiefs of general staffs of the European countries, the United States, and Canada will participate, have moved to a practical level. Finally, I would say that we managed to start the work of the Center for Averting Conflicts. In itself this may be a technical fact, but it is extremely important. The center, an all-European center, has begun its work. This is the positive side.

As far as the negative side is concerned, I must say directly that we did not manage to begin formulating an agreement on decreasing the number of forces in Europe. Of course this was a major shortcoming in our work. But I hope that in three weeks time when we resume our work here, we will manage to begin the formulation of this agreement too. [end recording]

U.S. Seen as Uncompromising on CFE

*LD3003051491 Moscow World Service in English
2300 GMT 29 Mar 91*

[News analyst Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Washington regards the differences in the interpretation of the already signed treaty—awaiting ratification—on conventional armaments in Europe as a stumbling block. Everything in it centers around actually one point. These are the three Soviet divisions situated on the shores of the Baltic and Black Seas. The Soviet side believes that these forces belong to the coastal defense and belong to the Navy, and for this reason they are not to be reduced under the treaty covering the ground troops. The American side does not agree to that.

It would seem that in such a case the already tested method should be used—looking for and finding a compromise. However, this method, which worked well earlier at Soviet-American talks, no longer suits the U.S. Administration for some reason. During a recent visit to Moscow, American Secretary of State James Baker was offered a compromise. But the United States refused to go its part of the way. Washington keeps sticking to an irreconcilable stand. Unless Moscow meets the U.S. demand, the administration won't put the treaty to Congress for ratification.

Initiatives put forward in the Senate also fail to find support. For example, Senator Joseph Biden has proposed that the treaty on conventional armaments in Europe can be ratified if a specific reservation is made which will (?fix) down the U.S. stand on the disputed issue. This move proposed by Senator Biden, indicating a search for a way out, was rejected by the State Department as wrong. Why be so categorical about a problem that has caused the differences in the stands of Moscow and Washington? The fact the problem remains unsolved has become an obstacle for advance in other areas of Soviet-American relations, and finishing work

on reducing strategic offensive armaments, and in setting the time for a visit to Moscow by President Bush, scheduled for the first half of this year.

As Senator Biden said, reasonable speaking at a Senate foreign relations subcommittee hearing, the CFE treaty is the key to unlocking not only valuable cuts in conventional arms but also progress on other fronts.

Some news analysts and political observers in the United States are currently writing much about the influence of the military in the Soviet Union on the talks to reduce arms. But whatever the influence, it does not prevent the Soviet Union from putting forward concrete compromises, including one on the problem that has arisen in the interpretation of the treaty to reduce conventional armaments in Europe.

U.S. Questions Soviet Compliance on Disarmament

*LD2803164291 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 28 Mar 91*

[Text] It's a long time since East-West relations experienced a crisis of trust. However, a sober look at their current condition shows that in the field of disarmament the situation is close to the one that kept the sides apart in the past. Mikhail Mayorov now comments:

This time, the treaty to cut conventional forces in Europe has evoked a serious controversy. Signed at a European conference in Paris last November, the treaty is faced with the risk of not being ratified unless doubts over the Soviet Union's compliance with the treaty are cleared up.

The United States secretary of state and his German and British colleagues who visited Moscow recently spoke with concern about thousands of Soviet tanks moved from Europe to areas east of the Ural Mountains and about three Soviet armored divisions being made subordinate to the Naval command. The West claims that all that made it possible to put these forces beyond the bounds of the Paris treaty.

The Soviet military argues that the redeployment of tanks and the change in the status of the armored divisions had taken place before the European heads of state and the leaders of the United States and of Canada put their signatures to the treaty. Besides, the USSR Defense Ministry says that NATO's leaders were informed about these steps in advance.

Yet, the reaction from Western capitals, in particular from Washington, was very sharp. The United States linked a future cut in strategic offensive arms with an improvement in the situation involving the conventional forces treaty. Disarmament has begun to slow down.

Wholesale support for either side is the last thing an impartial analyst should do. It's a hard fact that a certain amount of military equipment and manpower has been taken beyond the bounds of the conventional forces treaty, and our partners in the West, too, have reasons for alarm.

Reports published in Moscow following negotiations with James Baker, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, and Douglas Hurd produce the impression that President Gorbachev is concerned about that to a no smaller degree. After all, he deservedly takes the credit for the decisive contribution to current disarmament processes. He has been doing business in a sincere, open, (?uninterested) way, and it is very unlikely that his sole aim was to lure everybody in a trap. Apparently, this affair has come as a surprise to the president himself.

Yet, the situation is not hopeless as long as a credibility crisis is avoided. During James Baker's visit to Moscow, the Soviet Union put forward a number of proposals concerning the implementation of the conventional forces treaty. A message from President Bush delivered to President Gorbachev on Monday confirms the intention of the two countries to continue contacts in order to achieve clarity and progress at disarmament talks. Probably a further dialogue will prove helpful in finding a settlement. If the sides agree to spreading disarmament to the naval forces, many, if not all, of today's disputes will be lifted. The most important thing now is to keep the negotiations going.

NATO Military Structures Should Disband

LD0104182491 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS international news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The Jacques Delors plan—suggested by the president of the Commission of the European Communities (CEC), to add security and defence functions to the EC—was again discussed at the EC foreign ministers' unofficial meeting in Luxembourg.

Although the ministers agreed that a common foreign policy for the EC is inconceivable without a common security policy, they did not agree on practical steps despite a number of initiatives.

Initiatives include the idea of turning the Western European Union (WEU)—Western Europe's only organisation with powers in the field of defence—into the EC's military organisation and, in due course, into a component of the future political alliance of "the twelve".

The lack of specific decisions at the meeting was due to differing political and strategic interests of EC partners.

For example, Ireland, by virtue of its neutral status, favours organising cooperation in security by resolving disarmament and arms export control issues. Britain and Holland support the United States, which regards the intention to draw the WEU into the EC framework as a threat to the North Atlantic alliance, in which Washington holds a dominant position.

Only France, Italy, and Germany openly advocate the establishment of a fully-fledged defensive alliance of EC countries on the basis of WEU structures.

It is noteworthy that originally the Delors plan did not even hint at using the WEU. However, recently it became clear that the WEU would face serious changes, brought about by German reunification and reforms in the Soviet Union and East European countries. In this connection tendencies towards turning the union into a purely political organisation began to prevail in the WEU.

The Delors plan—which, incidentally, was firmly rejected by EC countries several years ago as running counter to the provisions of the treaty of Rome—is also not urgent or acutely critical to the community today.

Moreover, following the abolition of the military structures of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO), a search for ways to establish cooperative, non-bloc security structures appears to be more topical. This is precisely what is provided for by the charter of Paris for a new Europe.

Steps being taken in some places in the West to ensure European security with reliance on only Western military structures do not correspond to the spirit of the times.

Western military structures will hardly be able to serve this purpose without detriment to the CSCE process and nascent East-West confidence following the end of the Cold War era.

Clearly, the expansion of Western military structures will affect Soviet defence policy. Such expansion is fraught with the danger of undermining everything valuable that has already been gained in efforts to establish a European security system.

In such a situation, why shouldn't the West follow the example of the WTO, which made a bold step by eliminating its military structures, and begin together with the East to determine conditions and measures to ensure European security outside military blocs when the security of each state would be regarded as components of all-European security?

The West's steps in that direction would be regarded as a triumph of new political thinking and as efforts to consolidate positive changes in the international climate.

'World This Week' Discusses Japan Relations

LD3104220691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1030 GMT 31 Mar 91

["The World This Week: International Review" program hosted by Yevgeniy Tikhonovich Grachev, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator, with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Antsiferov, TASS political observer, and Yuriy Konstantinovich Tyssovskiy, TASS political observer—recorded]

[Excerpts] We present "The World This Week". Three international affairs journalists have gathered in our roundtable studio. They are Aleksandr Nikolayevich Antsiferov, TASS political observer; Yuriy Konstantinovich Tyssovskiy, TASS political observer; and Yevgeniy Tikhonovich Grachev, foreign affairs commentator for All-Union Radio, who is chairing the discussion.

[Grachev] Hello, comrades. We are living through interesting and difficult times. They are interesting because extremely diverse events are taking place before our eyes. All of us witness these events and we are participants in them. Our country is experiencing an interesting and dramatic period in its history. You know, comrades, which events are the most topical. They include the miners' strike and the mass meetings in Moscow and in other cities of our country. We are not living in isolation. We are living in a big, a huge, world, a world linked together by thousands of invisible and visible talk of positive developments in the international situation. Sometimes, these ties are severed in a very unwelcome way. That's when we talk of aggravation and confrontation in this or that region of the world. This is all, in one way or other, connected with life in our country.

In my view, there are events which only history can evaluate in a proper way. For example, the forthcoming

visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, to Japan, which will take place in just a few days time. After all, this is the first visit in the entire history of Soviet-Japanese relations. Basically this is an unprecedented event. Specialists believe it could also offer an unprecedented chance for a qualitative breakthrough, a chance which will make it possible to make a new start in bilateral relations, relations which at the moment are manifestly lagging behind the trend of the times.

[Antsiferov] One can, of course, agree with that assessment. Admittedly, in my view, we should not forget that ties between our country and Japan are of longstanding, generally speaking. After all, Japan is a very close neighbor of ours in the Far East. Our relations with this neighbor have had their ups and downs, as we know. There were times of good neighborliness. There were times of bellicose hostility.

[Grachev] There were times of very good cooperation.

[Antsiferov] I hope that such times, I was going to say that such times could return after the expected visit. Since the war, during the last 46 years, four Japanese prime ministers have paid official state visits to our country. However, you are absolutely right to say that a Soviet leader will, indeed, be paying a visit to the Japanese islands for the first time.

[Grachev] What's more, I stress, the visit will be by the head of state, not the head of government.

[Antsiferov] The head of state. Indeed, this visit comes at an auspicious time, when, in the first place, new political thinking has won a place in international practice. I would single out the following factors here: the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the establishment of normal relations between Moscow and Beijing, and, finally, the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea. Clearly, all three factors—their individual impact has of course varied, but when taken together they have influenced the political situation in the region.

[Grachev] I would add another point here, Aleksandr Nikolayevich—our country's position at the talks on arms reduction, on arms control, on limitation of strategic offensive weapons. After all, this is also a manifestation of new political thinking, making us speak of our country as a country striving to make its own, very noticeable and constructive contribution to the cause of strengthening universal peace. After all, this is also very important. At first glance, it might not seem to have much to do with Soviet-Japanese relations. But, if you give it some thought, the very fact that the Soviet Union is now withdrawing its troops from eastern Europe and Mongolia is not a gesture of goodwill. Rather, it is a purposeful peace policy which obliges people to regard our country in a new light.

[Antsiferov] I agree with you. I would like to add another point here. With the emergence of this process, I think that the Japanese, the leaders of Japan, are in this sense

a little worried that they have not been keeping up with this process. My argument might be countered by the assertion that it would not be a bad idea to step up our relations in the economic field. Undoubtedly, here, too, they are developing, or, to be more accurate, the fresh impetus which they require will not start from scratch.

By the old yardsticks, let's put it that way, our economic relations have been developing quite successfully. Proof of this, among other things, is the fact that Japan is our third biggest foreign trading partner, after the FRG and Finland. So, one might think that one could feel satisfied with this. But considering the industrial, economic, scientific and technical potential of our eastern neighbor, I believe that the prospects here are, of course, immense.

[Grachev] Yes, but we could ask this question, let's put it that way, of the Japanese side, too. After all, the Japanese side brought up the question known as the northern territories question or, as we also call it, the question of the four islands of the Kurile chain.

[Antsiferov] I'd like to correct you there. We're not talking about four islands, but eight. Here's why. We're talking about Kunashir Island, Iturup Island, Shikotan Island and a group of very small islands known as the Habomai group. Since the islands belonging to the Habomai group are quite tiny, people tend to talk about four islands.

[Grachev] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, I cannot say that you have very greatly taken me aback, by saying that there are actually eight islands. I always thought that there were four. But I can only say to myself once again, you live and learn. Now I know.

[Antsiferov] Well, the whole point is that apparently we are now discovering this problem for ourselves, too. I am referring to the population of the Soviet Union, because until recently we just did not bother, not so much to think about it, but rather to air this problem in public, in the press, on the radio or television.

[Grachev] Yes, our press, I mean, first and foremost, our foreign affairs journalists, somehow we very skillfully avoided all the knotty problems, avoided them in a really skillful way. We managed to refer to the subject without revealing the existence of a problem, without outlining its nature.

[Antsiferov] On the other side, there is nothing surprising about this, when you bear in mind that, until recently, state policy, in general, and our diplomacy, in particular, did not recognize at all that there were unresolved, controversial territorial problems between the Soviet Union and Japan. We had reason for this approach. The point is, if you go back to the beginning of our conversation, when we said that relations between our country and Japan go back a long time, you can see that the question of these islands also dates back quite a long time. It is generally recognized that these islands were settled, were, in fact, first discovered by Russian sailors. Enactments going back as far as the time of

Catherine II are proof of this. The legal aspects have until recently been the subject of quite considerable dispute.

The first interstate agreement relating to these islands is the Act of 1855, the so-called Russo-Japanese tract concluded, and signed, on behalf of Russia by Admiral Putyatin. Under this agreement, the border between Russia's islands and Japan's islands ran between the islands of Iturup and Urup. I mention this because Iturup is one of the islands whose return Japan is now demanding. In 1875, a treaty was signed between Russia and Japan, under which Russia agreed that all of Sakhalin Island would belong to it, while Japan, which had abandoned its claims to Sakhalin, would receive in exchange all the islands of the Kurile chain stretching as far as Kamchatka. Eventually, as you know, in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5, at Port Arthur, Russia...

[Grachev] Excuse me, Aleksandr Nikolayevich. Excuse me. Before you start discussing the events of 1904-5, I would like to make it clear that everything you have mentioned was the result of joint work, so to speak. This was the fruit of the efforts of the diplomacy of those days, of the ruling circles of those days, both in Russia and in Japan. In other words, as I understand it, all these treaties were voluntarily concluded by both sides.

[Antsiferov] I would not say that they were concluded on an entirely voluntary basis. For example, that same treaty of 1875, if you look at the time it was concluded, I remind you this was 1875, it was signed after the Crimean War, a very unsuccessful war for Russia. Russia emerged from this conflict greatly weakened, having lost much of its prestige. So, to a certain extent, Russia was forced to sign this treaty of 1875. To a certain extent, it made the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 an inevitability. This was a war for spheres of influence in Asian-Pacific region. [passage omitted]

The problem is that Japan does not recognize these islands as part of the Kurils chain. It considers that the Kurils chain ends with Urup Island. It does not include the other islands in the Kurils. So, what might seem a purely formal question of geography, whether the islands are part of the Kurils chain or not, has become a stumbling block in real politics.

[Tyssovskiy] But, here one should of course note that many hidden obstacles impede a solution of this complex problem. From the point of view of legality, international law, the rights of the Soviet Union to the Kurils chain are beyond doubt, one might think. They were confirmed by the Cairo Declaration, by the agreements in Yalta and Potsdam, and by the San Francisco treaty. There the Japanese side agreed, in black and white, to renounce its northern territories.

[Antsiferov] The situation is further complicated by the fact that the Soviet Union did not sign the San Francisco treaty. The Soviet Union refused to sign that treaty.

[Grachev] It had its own reasons for that.

[Antsiferov] Of course, the Cold War was in progress.

[Tyssovskiy] To all intents and purposes, this treaty laid the foundations for cooperation between the U.S. and Japan for quite a long time afterwards. Maybe that is why Japan agreed to part with the islands, considered to be its own sovereign territory, so as not to irritate the Soviet Union [words indistinct] difficult to surmount even if there exist certain factors which could lead to a compromise, even if such factors are revealed.

[Antsiferov] This is a kind of vicious circle. Some time back, [passage indistinct] indeed, there are also quite a few rocks there! But they are land masses covered in vegetation. They are extremely vegetated, with bamboo thickets and magnolia. But, indeed, the infrastructure is not developed there. That has to be admitted. The interesting thing is that during the referendum on 17 March, the population of the islands were asked to answer an extra question, about how they view the problem of possible, let's put it that way, or hypothetical, repatriation or eviction from the islands to the mainland, the suggestion that this might happen. The overwhelming majority, over 87 percent of the population, made it clear that they were categorically against the return of these islands to the jurisdiction of Japan.

[Grachev] In other words, the population of these islands are our people.

[Antsiferov] Our people, yes.

[Grachev] And, these people of ours consider the land of these islands to be their land.

[Antsiferov] Their land, of course. The people living there now are already the second or third generation. This is already a motherland to them. There is quite enough work to be done there, it has to be said. Although the main resource of these islands is fish, they are nevertheless very rich and fertile places.

[Tyssovskiy] Here, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, one has to add that, beautiful as these islands are, they are still important to the Soviet Union from a geostrategic point of view, and, correspondingly, to the Japanese. Therefore, this problem is extremely complex, and any compromise must be linked to mutual accords on the use of these islands. Maybe they should contain certain restrictions, so that neither side can make any serious complaints, so to speak, against the other.

[Antsiferov] Yes, that is correct, that is fair. Generally speaking, quite a number of drafts along these lines have now been proposed.

[Grachev] Nevertheless, it is widely felt abroad at the moment, out there is no real reason to dispute this view, that Soviet-Japanese relations are now entering the last decade of the 20th century burdened with problems, so to speak, problems which are becoming difficult to settle because of the unstable domestic political and economic situation in the Soviet Union, because of the uncertainty surrounding our country's switch to a market economy.

Just a year ago, there was a general feeling in Japanese business circles that real economic cooperation between Japan and the USSR would get going quite soon and that it would develop relatively smoothly. But now Japanese business circles are expressing a certain amount of caution. They wish to wait until a more or less distinct program for switching to the market emerges in our country. They want to see a stable situation in the Soviet Union, so that they can start developing these relations. But for the moment they are on their guard.

[Antsiferov] But, you know, Yevgeniy Tikhonovich, the Japanese are not too worried by the program, the measures which our country is taking for a switch to the market. Furthermore, one leading Japanese economist, Hiroshi Kato, in a recent interview, said that the USSR would probably need at least a decade to complete its economic reforms.

[Grachev] One decade?

[Antsiferov] One decade, yes. Nevertheless, he indicated that the smooth transfer to the market being implemented in our country was probably the best choice. In his view, for instance, the Yavlinskiy-Shatalin program, the so-called 500 days program, brilliantly compiled as it was, had one shortcoming—it was unrealistic. He welcomed the steps that are now being taken now and described them as wholly sensible. What's more, he expressed optimism that this program will succeed and that it will lead to the desired results, although this will take about 10 years.

[Tyssovskiy] He had the basic guidelines in mind. I believe, the basic guidelines for our further economic development.

[Antsiferov] Absolutely right. He had in mind those measures outlined by the government and the president.

[Tyssovskiy] All in all, you know, I am pleasantly surprised by the Japanese specialists, those involved in issues of the development of further cooperation with the Soviet Union, by their kind of indepth approach, perhaps even more indepth apparently than the one in our country. For instance, the Japanese papers have already learned about a whole number of projects. Unfortunately, nothing sensible about this has appeared in our press. According to their information, we intend to propose to Tokyo participation in the implementation of 20 joint economic projects to a total value of 1.2 trillion yen. That's a very large amount, approaching some 9 billion dollars. It is spread, so to speak, across three phases and includes five projects, to be realized within 5 years, 12 medium-term projects meant to take a decade, and three long-term projects only planned to be realized in the next century. This kind of phased approach, with an increasing involvement of resources and capacities in the development of the Soviet economy, leaves a favorable impression. This includes issues of the development of chemical, steelmaking and motor industries, such projects as the development of a natural gas deposit in Yakutsk and oil and gas deposits in

Sakhalin. If the political atmosphere promotes this kind of development of cooperation, this will produce a real shift. This is not supplies of food from the West, for which we are very grateful, which are meant to solve our short-term needs, so to speak. To my mind, the Japanese are looking much deeper, although, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, they, too, are providing us with, let's say, transient assistance.

[Antsiferov] I would like to add something to what you said here. To my mind, the Japanese understanding and perception of our problems can perhaps partly be explained by the fact that essentially after World War II, Japan itself transferred from administrative-command methods to the market.

[Tyssovskiy] That's an interesting idea.

[Antsiferov] If you recall, up to that moment Japan's economy had been totally militarized.

[Grachev] That's hardly a surprise. The country was run by a son of heaven, they were the empire under heaven.

[Antsiferov] Absolutely, and all the strings of economic control were practically held by the same hand.

[Grachev] I think that among all the administrative-command systems models, this one, imperial, was the most ideal administrative-command system.

[Antsiferov] Well, apart from our own, our homegrown one. Anyway, the Japanese succeeded in this transition from administrative-command methods of controlling economy. They succeeded, not without assistance from the United States. I think that without that assistance it would hardly have been so successful. But I think that if we look at what Jaan used to be and what it is now, this example could be quite inspiring for us.

[Grachev] I would add the following to what Yuriy Konstantinovich said. I happen to have read papers by Japanese political scientists who make recommendations to businessmen. They think that Japan is lagging behind its West European partners in respect of long-term investment in the Soviet Union and this gap ought to be closed, think the Japanese scientists. This could be long-term investments for the development of infrastructures, provision of commodity loans and full attainment of ruble convertibility. These forms of cooperation mean not only mutual profits but also opportunities to put to use all the best that the partners have in the fields of management, administration of the economy, technologies, equipment, Japan should do everything that depends on it, while the Soviet partners should cease their internal disputes and get down to business. That's what the Japanese scientists think.

[Antsiferov] I think that here, too, they are showing their talent, their ability to look ahead.

[Tyssovskiy] I feel that among some conservative figures, so to speak, perhaps among our economists, this conversation will give rise to the feeling that we are now ready to sell off the Soviet Union, or at least the Far East, to Japan.

[Antsiferov] Well, I don't think so. Precisely because our interests are, all in all, interlinked, and in many things supplement each other, although they clash on very serious issues, this makes the Soviet president's coming visit to Japan so intriguing for the journalists and -

[Grachev] Promising for businessmen.

[Antsiferov] Promising for businessmen.

[Grachev] Note the seriousness of the talks that took place here in Moscow last week, note the visit to Tokyo by Bessmertnykh, USSR foreign affairs minister. I think all these are good indications, good signs. Let us not enthuse over events in advance and let us not try to guess things ahead. But I think that with a favorable combination of circumstances, the visit could be very, very successful.

[Antsiferov] I think that the trip by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Soviet foreign affairs minister, is precisely connected with finalizing various aspects. I think, by the way, that this was not the last contact at diplomatic level on the eve of the visit. I think there is still much work

ahead in preparing the visit, in ensuring its success, because both sides are interested in that success. And not just Japan and the Soviet Union, but also all the countries of the Asian-Pacific region, because undoubtedly the normalization and improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and Japan will have consequences for the whole region. The work will be intensive, it will be far from simple, but I hope it will be done successfully, because the stakes are too great.

[Grachev] I agree with you, Aleksandr Nikolayevich and I would again like to explain to our listeners the fact that this is the first visit by the head of our state to the land of the rising sun in the history of bilateral relations.

We shall be reporting in our program the progress of the visit, the progress of the negotiations, what decisions are being reached there, what documents are being signed.

And now, esteemed comrades, we are out of time. The participants in the roundtable say good-bye to you. Taking part in the programme were Aleksandr Antsiferov, TASS political observer; Yuriy Tyssovskiy, TASS political observer, and Yevgeniy Grachev, all-Union Radio foreign political commentator. Good-bye, comrades.

[Antsiferov] Good-bye.

[Tyssovskiy] All the best to you.

United States & Canada

Calls for Review of USSR-U.S. Ties Viewed

PM0104160191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by V. Gan: "Back to 'Normal Rivalry'?"]

[Text] Washington—Arguments that it is necessary to review the conceptual basis of Soviet-U.S. relations which has developed in recent years have become fashionable on the Potomac recently. Moreover, it is being reported from some circles that such a review has already begun in administration components responsible for policy formulation. It is plain that for the time being it will be carried out behind tightly closed doors—the current U.S. president's entourage is not particularly notorious for information leaks. But to judge from statements by informed people with access to Bush's staff, what is being discussed is the transfer of our relations from partnership to what one local official described as "normal rivalry."

Why has Washington embarked on this at precisely this time? What is compelling the American side, which only yesterday seemed to be bathed in rosy benevolence, to embark on a rethink of political-strategic tenets vis-a-vis the Soviet Union? For all the complexity of the picture, I believe that some kind of explanation is possible.

It is no secret that both the Americans and ourselves are inclined to become euphoric the moment there is a hint of a tendency toward mutual understanding and cooperation. In general terms this is an understandable phenomenon—weariness with the long years of confrontation and malice is probably a factor. But the disappointment is therefore all the sharper when it suddenly becomes clear that the idyll is still as distant as the moon, that the wish is by no means yet the reality, no matter how strong the wish to present it as such.

I do not exaggerate when I say that the flames of war in the Persian Gulf region clearly illuminated the fragility or shakiness of the Soviet-American consensus, which had "worked" more or less satisfactorily hitherto.

But, on the other hand, people here who are no friends to us acknowledged and continue to acknowledge that without this consensus it would have been impossible to create the coalition and condemn Baghdad's aggression in an essentially united front of UN members.

But to some extent the whole trouble is that some people in the administration have rushed into a decision that since the USSR has been conducting a constructive dialogue with the United States and since it is prepared for radical measures to improve the international climate, it is therefore virtually the USSR's duty to promote the implementation of American foreign policy objectives. As if the Kremlin's foreign policy must become a kind of continuation of Washington's foreign policy, and any deviation from the American "agenda"

should be interpreted as evidence that Moscow is regressing to the belligerent days of the icy period in our relations.

It has long been known that impressions often prove to be more important than actual reality. This seems to have been entirely true in this case. Ingenious ideas have unfortunately dimmed the sight of some Washington figures, making it impossible for them to take a sober view of what is happening in the world, our country, and the Persian Gulf region alike. The main criterion at the present stage is tantamount to the definition: Is the USSR loyal—as Washington sees it—to the crusade against Husayn or not?

It is claimed here that in connection with the war in the Gulf such conservatively-inclined administration figures as Defense Secretary Cheney, presidential national security aide Scowcroft and his deputy, Gates, and CIA Director Webster have been squeezing a "liberal" State Department headed by Baker. That they are the source of the tougher approach to the Soviet Union and bilateral relations as a whole. If this is so, you can guess the bases they are operating on. They are evident from their public statements and fit into the same pattern—the USSR is allegedly still half a century away from a real market economy, the course of political reform remains uncertain, Gorbachev has fallen under the influence of the KGB and the military, and in general the country is moving toward mass civil disorder and even civil war.... The logical conclusion from this is that Moscow and Washington cannot and must not act in concert with each other in the international arena. Rather the U.S. "superpower" and the USSR should pursue their own often divergent interests—sometimes even at each other's expense.

It is difficult not to notice that this is calling into question the foundation of fruitful cooperation laid by the two countries, cooperation which has already secured historic achievements, although the supporters of such an approach also insist that they do not envisage the reactivation of the "cold war" but most want to inject "more pragmatism" into relations by eliminating euphoric visions from them.

To a partial extent these arguments are already visible in Washington's current foreign policy philosophy, as was discernible from the recent presidential "State of the Union" message. While preaching "multilaterality" of partnership in a new world order, at the same time Bush constantly stressed American exclusiveness. "We bear a unique responsibility for doing the difficult work of freedom. The United States, alone among the countries of the world, possesses the moral authority and means to support it," Bush says. If the pathos is peeled away from these remarks the concept that emerges is approximately as follows: The United States leads the world, and its partners uncomplainingly follow it. How does this differ from a revival of the old dream of a Pax Americana—and American-style peace.

Yes, no secret should be made of our problems. The contradiction-torn Union is in a state of crisis, and this is widely acknowledged. But the United States, too, is not in such great financial shape that it can allow itself to pick up the tab and tell those who can what they should do on vitally important questions. Like Germany or Japan, for example. A big role in the coalition is currently played by the task of ensuring reliable sources of cheap oil. But will such unity be possible in future conflicts? "U.S. policymakers must acknowledge that a new world order cannot be created to American specifications," former Secretary of State H. Kissinger wrote recently.

A perfectly reasonable remark. To expect other countries to look at the world through Washington's eyes is an illusion. It is obvious that it can be changed for the better only on the principles of equal partnership, a balance of each and every one's interest, or at least an awareness and consideration of where these interests coincide and where they diverge.

Of course a reexamination of Soviet-American relations is not a bad thing in itself. The only thing is that it is necessary to display a sense of responsibility here, keeping in mind that they remain most important and central for both countries and that maintaining and developing cooperation between the USSR and the United States is in our mutual interests. Plainly there will be no smooth "highway" into the future; there will probably be ruts and potholes. The main thing is that they should not be anti-Soviet or anti-American in nature. Our country has stated at the highest level that the course toward further normalization will be continued. President Bush has also spoken a great deal in this vein. There is obviously a realization that it is easier to destroy than to create. The only question is what will happen in practice.

China

Bessmertnykh's Visit to Beijing Reported

Commentary Previews Visit

OW0104195591 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1000 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Station commentator (Kondrayev) report]

[Text] Dear listeners, Soviet Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh has arrived in Beijing from Tokyo to begin his official visit. What is the purpose of his visit? Please listen to the following report by our station commentator (Kondrayev):

During the visit, Bessmertnykh will first discuss with the Chinese side the details of the forthcoming visit of Jiang Zemin, General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee, to the Soviet Union in May this year. The two sides will also exchange views on the present situation of

Soviet-Chinese relations. Of course, they will also discuss matters concerning foreign relations. In addition, the new Soviet foreign minister will establish personal contacts with Chinese leaders. He will meet with Premier Li Peng.

Chinese leaders' visits to Moscow are a continuation of the Soviet-Chinese summit dialogue. Soviet President Gorbachev began the dialogue during his visit to China in May 1989. In the nearly two years after his 1989 visit, what changes have taken place in the relations between the two countries? We may say without any exaggeration that fundamental changes have taken place in bilateral relations during the period. The confrontation that existed not long ago has come to an end. The two countries have begun to restore rapidly and successfully the good relations of the past. The bilateral relations have been restored in political, economic, cultural, and military fields, as well as in party affairs. Both Moscow and Beijing attach great importance to developing relations. The development of their relations is of great significance not only to the Soviet Union and China, but also to the entire world, particularly to the Asia-Pacific region. It is because good-neighborliness and friendliness have replaced confrontation on the borders of the two countries. In this regard, it is worth our attention that the two countries have displayed a realistic spirit of mutual respect. I believe that Jiang Zemin's visit will accelerate and deepen the process of restoring good and closer relations between the two countries.

On international issues, it is apparent that the foreign ministers of the two countries will discuss the overall situation of the Asian-Pacific region and exchange views on the situation in Cambodia and the situation on the Korean peninsula. It is very clear that tensions in Cambodia and on the Korean peninsula are remnants of the cold war, which run counter to the general trend of peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific region. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union and China can make important contributions to the settlement of the issues in Cambodia and on the Korean peninsula. It is reported that the two sides will also discuss in detail the postwar Gulf situation. In short, the Beijing talks will be very rich in content.

Arrives 31 Mar

LD3103130991 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov]

[Text] Beijing March 31 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh arrived here today on a two-day visit.

At Beijing Airport he was met by Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei and other Chinese officials. Soviet ambassador to China was among the welcoming party.

The Soviet delegation includes Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev.

"This is my first visit to Beijing. We have a very important programme for talks. I hope that it will be successfully fulfilled during my visit," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh told reporters at the Beijing airport today.

Meets PRC Counterpart

LD0104073791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0602 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov]

[Text] Beijing, 1 Apr (TASS)—Talks began today between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who arrived in China Sunday on a working visit, and PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen at the "Diaoyutai" government residence in Beijing.

This is the first time I have visited the People's Republic of China and I am most grateful to my Chinese comrades for the opportunity they have provided to discuss Soviet-Chinese relations and the world situation, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated at the start of the talks. I consider the present meetings and talks, he noted, as a continuation of personal contacts and also of the international policies of the Soviet Union and China.

The sides will devote much attention to exchanging opinions on a range of issues in Soviet-Chinese relations in the light of the preparation for the forthcoming official friendly visit to the USSR by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party in May. The heads of the foreign policy departments of the two countries will also discuss current international issues that are of mutual interest. In particular, they will look in detail into the issues of the postcrisis settlement in the Persian Gulf and into the prospects for the situation in the Asian-Pacific region. An exchange of opinions on the settlement of the Cambodia issue and on the situation in the Korean peninsula will take place.

After concluding talks with Qian Qichen, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh will be received by Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council.

Meets Chinese Premier

CM0204104591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
Second Edition 2 Apr 91 p 5

[TASS headline: "Continuation of Dialogue"]

[Text] Beijing 1 April, (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh has paid a working visit to China. The visit was a continuation of the now traditional intensified dialogue between the USSR and the PRC on bilateral and world affairs.

A.A. Bessmertnykh had a meeting with Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council. The Soviet side expressed

satisfaction at the state of relations with China, a sound foundation for which was laid by the visits of M.S. Gorbachev to Beijing and of Li Peng to Moscow. It was noted that we are ready to continue to make comprehensive efforts to develop reciprocal good-neighborly cooperation in the interests of the peoples of the two countries, the world, and international security.

Li Peng expressed similar interest. Describing the difficulties being experienced by the Soviet Union as temporary, in view of the mighty potential of the USSR, the premier of the PRC State Council expressed hope for the success of restructuring. He spoke of the great opportunities which have not yet been used for economic cooperation between two great neighboring states, particularly in light of the complementary nature of their economic structures.

The Soviet minister and the head of the Chinese Government exchanged opinions on basic trends in the current international situation, noting the importance of close Soviet-Chinese contacts concerning problems in this area.

Both sides stressed the great significance of the forthcoming visit to the USSR by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which will doubtless give new impetus to expanding Soviet-Chinese ties and will be a major event not only in the history of relations between the two countries but also in world politics.

The talks between A.A. Bessmertnykh and PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen were oriented toward another Soviet-Chinese summit. The ministers agreed that over the remaining period of time before the meeting, "the traffic lights will be signalling only green" for Soviet-Chinese contacts in all spheres. The intention was declared to intensify work on the issues which are being discussed at the talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and strengthening trust in the military sphere, in the region of the Soviet-Chinese border.

The talks in Beijing were held in a friendly atmosphere and were rich in content and mutually useful.

Departs 2 Apr

LD0204122991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1015 GMT 2 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov]

[Text] Beijing, 2 Apr (TASS)—Having successfully completed his two-day working visit to China, USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh departed this afternoon for Moscow. He was seen off at the capital's Shoudu Airport by Tian Zengpei, PRC vice minister of foreign affairs, and senior staff of the Chinese Foreign Ministry. Among those seeing him off was USSR Ambassador to the PRC N.N. Solov'yev.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh told a TASS correspondent before his departure for home that Soviet-Chinese relations for the last two years have been developing at an ever increasing pace. Two years is a rather short time, counting from the visit to China by M.S. Gorbachev and the visit of Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, to the USSR, which followed. Another Soviet-Chinese summit will take place in the near future. This time we are expecting Jiang Zemin, secretary general of the CPC Central Committee, to pay a visit to Moscow. The minister stressed that the relations between our two countries have been fully normalized. The Soviet Union and China are broadening cooperation in the most varied fields; the sides are building their relations on a new foundation of complete trust and equality.

Chinese Coverage Noted

WA0204151491

For Chinese reportage on Bessmertnykh's visit to the PRC, including reports on talks between Bessmertnykh and Chinese Premier Li Peng and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, see the Soviet Union section of the 1 April issue of the China DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to Japan Previewed

Seen as 'Truly Historic'

LD2803132391 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1125 GMT 28 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Aleksandrov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 28 Mar (TASS)—“The forthcoming visit by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Japan is called upon to be truly historic: It will be the first visit by a head of Soviet state to Japan in the history of Soviet-Japanese relations, and never before has it been intended to sign so many agreements of such a multilateral and weighty content as is planned.” Aleksandr Panov, chief of the directorate of countries of the Pacific Ocean and Southeast Asia of the USSR Foreign Ministry, expressed this opinion in an interview to the TASS correspondent today.

In the words of the highly placed diplomat, the work to prepare the visit by the USSR president is coming to an end. At present, eight agreements have been agreed fully with the Japanese side, a further three are at the finishing stage of work, and work on three or four joint documents continues. The final generalizing document—a joint Soviet-Japanese statement which is calculated for the long term and embraces both bilateral relations and cooperation in international affairs—is near completion. The intergovernmental agreements which have been prepared provide for practical cooperation between the sides in a number of directions which are new to Soviet-Japanese relations and also the substantial expansion of

the forms of cooperation in its traditional spheres, Aleksandr Panov stressed. [passage omitted]

The question of the four southern islands of the Kuril ridge is the main problem on which the position of the two countries differ, Aleksandr Panov pointed out. At the same time, he noted, both sides have become franker in discussing the territorial problem and understood better not just each other's arguments but also the domestic and foreign policy background on which these arguments are based. In Aleksandr Panov's opinion, there are no simple solutions to the territorial problem and to settle it an atmosphere of trust in bilateral relations must be created. At the same time, he refuted the conjectures and rumors that the Japanese may buy the four islands of the Kurile Ridge. The Soviet side has never raised the question thus and does not intend to raise it, Aleksandr Panov stated.

The problem existing in Soviet-Japanese relations of POW's also demands a solution, the diplomat said. Over 600,000 Japanese were imprisoned in the USSR after World War II, and around 40,000 of them died for various reasons and are buried in the Soviet Union. At present, he reported, the sides are completing work on an agreement which will settle questions of handing over lists of those who died and of prisoners to the Japanese side, lists of cemeteries and their sites and of maintaining burial places fittingly. The question of Russian POW's who died in Japan, who ended up there during the Russian-Japanese war of 1904-1905, will be decided also. Although the agreement has not yet been signed, the USSR president will take with him to Japan the first list of those Japanese POW's who died in the Soviet Union, Aleksandr Panov reported in conclusion.

TASS Notes Preparations

LD3103135991 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Kuchko and Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo March 31 TASS—A Japanese public committee to organize Gorbachev's visit, which was set up in Tokyo recently, is preparing to accord a warm welcome to the Soviet president in Japan, which will be commensurate with the importance of the top Soviet leader's official visit to this country, the first in the history of bilateral relations.

The committee comprises some 140 people, among them prominent politicians and public figures, deputies to parliament, businessmen, trade unionists, scientists, cultural personalities and journalists.

Japanese former Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe is head of the committee. He visited the Soviet Union on several occasions and was one of the initiators of organizing the welcoming ceremony for the Soviet president.

The committee involves such prominent figures as former Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita, House of Representatives Speaker and Chairman of the parliamentary Soviet-Japanese Friendship Association Yoshio Sakurauchi, leaders of virtually all major political parties and the four leading associations of Japanese businessmen.

"We sincerely welcome the Soviet president's forthcoming visit to Japan and hope that it will become an important point of departure in establishing truly good-neighbourly ties between our countries and peoples," committee Executive Secretary and member of parliament from the Liberal Democratic Party Keizo Obuchi told TASS.

"Therefore, the committee, which was formed at the initiative of the Liberal Democratic Party, involved representatives from the broadest sections of the Japanese public. We want Japan and the Soviet Union to enter the 21st century as good neighbours," Obuchi said.

The committee plans to give reception in honour of Gorbachev, at which some 2,000 people will be present.

The committee regards as the all-important task in its activity to acquaint the Japanese public with Soviet people's traditions, culture and life and plans to set up a fund of Japanese-Soviet cultural ties.

Science, Technology Treaties Signed With DPRK

New Level of Cooperation Expected

SK0204071291 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 1 Apr 91

[From "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] Working-level treaties and projects related to cooperation were signed between the DPRK-Soviet State Committees for Science and Technology in Pyongyang last week. A treaty on cooperation was also signed between the Soviet-DPRK Friendship Society and the DPRK-Soviet Friendship Society.

Until recently, dozens of such treaties on economic, scientific, technological, and cultural fields had been concluded between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. An incident which dumbfounded the delegates of the DPRK and Soviet sides took place last fall, however. This was the establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul.

Pyongyang regarded this incident as very grave. It seemed that, owing to this incident, the governments of the Soviet Union and the DPRK made the decision to use convertible currency in both trade and economic relations. The Soviet Union has continued to consolidate various cooperation and traditional friendships.

We think that taking into consideration existing world trends is not a barrier to cooperation. Rather, we recognize that this will raise cooperation to a new level and will more completely conform to mutual interests.

For a week, the delegates of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology and the Soviet-DPRK Friendship Society held a meeting with the DPRK under very strained conditions. As a result, for the first time this year Soviet-DPRK treaties were signed.

It will be awhile before we will be able to see the effectiveness of the treaties. Those attending the meeting try to evaluate the treaties on the whole. We can hear such an evaluation in an interview with station reporter (Konstan Belov) in Pyongyang.

Officials Interviewed

SK0204073391 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Interview with Han Sang-pyo, vice chairman of DPRK State Science and Technology Committee, and Mikhail Kruglov, deputy chairman of Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, by unidentified station correspondent, place and date not given—from the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] [Correspondent] As the result of the 23th meeting of the Subcommittee for Soviet-DPRK Scientific and Technological Cooperation held on 25 March, an agreement was signed.

This is a new protocol which extends cooperation in the scientific and technological fields. The agreement is a 1991-1995 cooperative project between scientific and technological committees. In addition, it is a work plan for this year.

The agreement was signed by Mikhail Kruglov, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, and by Han Sang-pyo, vice chairman of the DPRK State Science and Technology Committee.

[Han] The 23th meeting of the Subcommittee for the Soviet-DPRK Science and Technology discussed receiving the Soviet comrades' help in settling urgent scientific and technological questions arising in the development of our country's national economy, teaching the Soviet comrades our country's traditional medical technology, and other issues beneficial to both countries.

I am sure that this will fully satisfy the interests of the people of the two countries and will greatly contribute to the future development of science and technology in the two countries.

[Correspondent] Answering questions on convertible currency in the Soviet-DPRK scientific and technological cooperation and on the effect of convertible currency, Mikhail Kruglov, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, said:

[Kruglov] We negotiated these questions in detail and reached an agreement to press ahead with cooperation without such convertible currency.

The issue concerning the costs, which should be paid by both sides, is not yet settled. We will continue with the existing method.

[Correspondent] Is this because the scientific and technological cooperation promises considerable, substantial profit? Would you be specific about the profits?

[Kruglov] The Soviet side has learned much advanced technology on oriental medicine from the DPRK. The cooperation with [word indistinct] Company is very beneficial to us.

We have already signed an agreement with the company. Company delegates are now staying in the Soviet Union and preparing for the conclusion of a treaty with the relevant Soviet companies and enterprises.

In the mean time, we are helping the DPRK with (phosphorus coal) processing technology, which is a completely new field for the DPRK. Since the estimated amount of (phosphorus coal) deposit is not much, it is unreasonable to use it only for fuel.

The Soviet Union has much technology for processing (phosphorus coal). The raw materials in (phosphorus coal) can be used for various medicines, cosmetics, and [word indistinct].

ROK General's Appointment to UN Command Cited

PM0204091391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent S. Tikhomirov: "On the One Hand, Legitimate..."]

[Text] Pyongyang, 27 Mar—The delegations of the Korean People's Army and the Army of Chinese People's Volunteers to the Military Armistice Commission in Korea have condemned the appointment of a South Korean general as chief delegate of the UN Forces Command to that commission.

In a statement carried today by KCNA, this step is regarded as a gross violation of the armistice agreement in Korea.

On the one hand, the appointment of South Korean Major General Hwang Won-taek is legitimate, because the right to choose a candidacy for this post belongs to the commander of the UN forces—in this case the American Robert Riscassi. On the other hand, since the end of the "Korean war" South Korea has not only not signed the armistice agreement but has also generally opposed this document. So the North Korean-Chinese protest is perfectly logical.

I will remind you that the military commission was created in 1953 following the signing of the armistice

agreement in Korea. The Americans have invariably nominated the chief delegate from the UN forces. It was only at the end of last year that there was talk of appointing representatives from the south to this post—which was roundly condemned by Pyongyang at the time.

By whatever good intentions the United States was guided in releasing the chief delegate's chair to a South Korean general (and the Americans believe this will promote the commission's more efficient working), the DPRK's opinion clearly must not be disregarded. The commission's work has now essentially been paralyzed.

Conference on Asian Security Planned in Jun

LD0104092191 Moscow TASS in English 0558 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Bokhonko]

[Text] Manila April 1 TASS—Fourteen countries, including the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan, and China, will participate in an Asian security and cooperation conference which will be held in Manila from June 5 to 7, this year, the Philippine Foreign Ministry announced today.

They will discuss a qualitatively new situation that has taken shape in the region in view of the end of the cold war and the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as the role which the great powers are called upon to play in ensuring security in the Far East.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Malaysian Proposal for Economic Bloc Assessed

HK2303093491 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 16 Mar 91

[Vasiliy Filipov commentary]

[Text] Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed proposed the setting up of a new economic bloc in Southeast Asia. This issue was part of the recently-concluded Asean meeting held in Bali, Indonesia. The talks, in general, yielded positive results in connection with the proposal submitted by the member-nations. But other countries in the Asia Pacific region are opposed to the Malaysian initiative. A Japanese newspaper, (KYODO JOZIN), quoted that Washington did not welcome the move.

The Malaysian proposal surfaced after the failure of the Uruguay talks on GATT. Kuala Lumpur and other nations believe that attempts to shift the prices in the world market will only be detrimental to developing countries. This move shows that there is a tendency to divide the international market and create different economic blocks in which protectionism prevails.

Washington has set up a U.S., Canadian trade zone and there is a plan to expand it to the Latin American countries. On the other hand, another economic bloc was created in Western Europe whose primary aim is to have a single market in the continent by 1992.

Filipov thinks that Kuala Lumpur's initiative is a positive alternative because its major objective is to strengthen regional and trade cooperation, not divisiveness. According to an Asian diplomat, the world is not a melon that can be divided.

Australia proposed the creation of a bloc in the Asia-Pacific region called the ASEAN Pacific Economic Cooperation which includes Japan, the United States, Canada, and the ASEAN nations. Will this bloc bring only small benefits to member countries in comparison with the Malaysian proposal? Initially it seems not. However, one and a half years after its establishment, no concrete program has been achieved. Observers say the reason could be attributed to the influence of the three big countries in the bloc because they do not consider the interest of the ASEAN countries. According to Filipov, these powerful countries have a great deal to do with the failure of the Uruguay talks and, needless to say, their negative response to the Kuala Lumpur proposal shows that they want to maintain a prominent role in the ASEAN economic bloc. Kuala Lumpur's proposal does not have the intention of competing with the ASEAN Pacific Economic Cooperation because it only addresses the Southeast Asian region. Filipov believes that this prospect would lead to the economic and political development of the ASEAN countries. In this connection, Malaysia is strengthening its diplomatic moves to align the position of the other member countries. Kuala Lumpur thinks the issue will be more clear by the end of the year if the new economic bloc materializes.

Malaysian Official Considers Soviet ASEAN Role

*HK2303093091 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 15 Mar 91*

[Text] ASEAN nations are considering including the Soviet Union in the economic bloc talks traditionally participated in by the United States, the European Economic Community, Japan, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. This was announced by Malaysian Foreign Minister Omar Abu Hassan in a media briefing in Kuala Lumpur. According to him, the Soviet Union is interested in holding talks with the ASEAN nations so the matter is under consideration.

Manila's Economic Development Plan Assessed

*HK3003031691 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 29 Mar 91*

[Aleksander Kuznetsov commentary on the Philippine Senate's passage of a bill encouraging foreign capital investment]

[Text] Senator Vicente Paterno said Manila has no other choice but to implement the bill encouraging foreign capital inflow if it wants to be on a par with its other ASEAN neighbors. Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand have succeeded in inviting foreign investors. The ASEAN countries are bringing into the world market not only raw materials but also new industrial products. Specialists claim that in order to maximize foreign capital inflow, infrastructure should be provided. This includes good roads, proper communication facilities, and dockyards.

Manila has received from Tokyo a \$600-million loan to use for infrastructure projects. With this grant the Aquino administration hopes to resolve labor problems. The Philippine Government plans to increase employment by 1.2 million. Senators do not want foreign capital to have complete control over the country, however.. This is why the bill stipulates partial participation of foreign investors, particularly in industries closely linked to the country's security.

Another serious problem for Manila is its huge foreign debt. Experts quantify it at \$28 billion. Observers believe that Washington took advantage of this problem in the bases talks.

Lending and other forms of credit are used in world transactions, such as debt servicing between countries. If the amount lent is spent to develop major industries it has positive results in the economy. Foreign capital should be limited by local laws and this is seen in the case of Indonesia.

The prospects for economic development in the Philippines will depend on how effectively Manila will use the positive experiences of its ASEAN counterparts.

U.S. Bases Issue in Philippines Still Unresolved

*HK2303040291 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines
1300 GMT 22 Mar 91*

[Alexander Gornetchov commentary]

[Text] In a statement given to President Corazon Aquino, senators said that their opposition to the retention of U.S. military bases in the country was due to the very minimal compensation Washington was willing to give in exchange for use of military facilities, particularly in Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base which, according to the current treaty in effect, will expire in September of this year.

In relation to this, talks between the two countries have already been going on for almost a year. In the current talks, Gornetchov said, Washington has been putting economic pressures on Manila to soften the latter's position. Undoubtedly, the economic situation in the country is unfavorable and other problems have aggravated the debt problem, which now stands at \$22 billion. Under these conditions, any amount from the military bases compensation cannot be of much help even if

Washington were willing to pay \$520 million per year. Manila, on the other hand is insisting that Washington should pay \$825 million each year.

Meanwhile, President Aquino announced recently that the Philippines will propose partial debt condonation in exchange for the retention of the U.S. military bases. According to Gornetchov, disagreements between the two countries regarding bases compensation and duration of retention are bound to get worse in the coming days and, most likely, there will be some haggling. In such a case, Gornetchov said that the actual agreement may be changed since the Philippine Senate has to ratify any agreement reached. Based on a report from the DAILY INQUIRER, the majority of the senators are against the future agreement. Will the amount be reduced? If so, how much? According to Gornetchov, the current military bases agreement is about to expire and the primary issues have not yet been resolved.

Philippine Official on Soviet Use of Subic Bay

LD3104200491 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Interview with Richard Gordon, "mayor of Olango town" in the Republic of the Philippines, by correspondent V. Konnov; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Konnov] The last round of talks has begun in Manila between the U.S. and the Philippines on the future of the American military bases. [passage omitted] Mayor Gordon, how would you assess the possibility of Soviet civilian ships visiting Subic Bay, for example, for repair and for refuelling?

[Gordon] We intend to make Subic Bay an open port. Even if some of the Americans' military installations remain here, after consultations with them and with our military, I think that we can remove the obstacles to Soviet ships visiting. Previously, during the cold war, things were different, of course, but now we shall welcome Soviet ships in Subic Bay.

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Examines Arab-Israeli Conflict

Part I

PM2103145791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Mar 91 Union Edition p 5

[First in a series of "Reportage From Israel and the Occupied Territories" by IZVESTIYA special correspondents Yevg. Bay and V. Skosyrev: "Still Under Arms"; Jerusalem-Moscow dateline]

[Excerpt] Jerusalem-Moscow—[passage omitted] For how many years will we still be able to withstand the confrontation? Arab states will not offer us real peace

without a resolution of the Palestinian problem. The arms race will not stop even if there are no more wars.

This was said by a man who has given many years of his life to the Israeli Army. Aharon Yariv rose to the rank of general and was chief of military intelligence.

"How does this bode for our state," he went on. "Let us ponder this. Let us compare the Arab countries' and Israel's population and economic potential. They are simply incomparable. In 30 years we have succeeded in taking the lead in the arms sphere. But buying Mirage fighters from the French at a time when the Arabs were procuring MiG-17's from the USSR is one thing. State-of-the-art technology of the class used in the West is quite another. It is far more costly, and Israel simply does not have the money to ensure military parity over the next 25 years."

Today the former intelligence chief heads the Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University and, in conjunction with a group of like-minded people—retired officers, is trying to prove that keeping the status quo is not the country's best option. The only sensible way out is to reach an agreement, that is, to pay the Arabs the price for recognizing Israel and for peace. The general reckons that the occupied territories might be that price. It is, in particular, a question of returning the Golan Heights to Syria and agreeing to form a Palestinian state on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza Strip. The emergence of such a state should be preceded by a period of transition during which measures would be introduced guaranteeing Israel's security and helping the Palestinians to create an autonomous economy.

"We now have an historic chance of reaching agreement, but I am afraid that we will miss it. Most of my compatriots who have just lived through missile bombardments do not even want to hear about concessions," the general acknowledged.

Perhaps he is overpessimistic? Did the Israelis not behave reasonably and flexibly during the crisis, sacrificing at least two of their strategy's "sacred cows"? The first of these tenets says that Israel will never turn its defense over to a foreign power, albeit even a friendly power. When the bombardments began, this rule was shelved and the Israelis thankfully accepted the services of the Americans, who provided their "Patriot" antimissile system.

Second, the Israelis did not bring into play another cast-iron principle of former years: An eye for an eye, no attack should remain unanswered. Strictly speaking, this was the basis of their deterrence strategy as regards their neighbors.

This time the inevitable attack did not ensue. Heeding President Bush's call and setting its—rightly understood—state interests above its desire for retribution, Israel won the sympathies of the Western public, which had a few months earlier branded it for its harsh treatment of the Palestinians. Saddam Husayn's aggression

relegated the Palestinian problem to the back burner and wiped out West Europeans' memory of soldiers on the occupied territories responding with bullets to the intifadah's stones. Trust in Israel increased. As a result, France's LE MONDE made the witty comment: "The vulnerable state—Goliath—has once again become David."

Needless to say, this change of roles was also promoted by the fact that Iraq, aspiring to the status of regional superpower, has been knocked out of play for a long time. Even if it does not have to pay Kuwait reparations, people here believe that it will still take at least 10 years to restore its economy.

Y. 'Arafat, who undermined the PLO's international reputation by taking up position in the same camp as Saddam Husayn, has also done Tel Aviv a great service.

In short, the balance of forces has improved for Israel. But regrettably, it does not follow from this that Israel has become less implacable and more inclined to compromise. General Yariv was right in this, as we saw during our conversations.

...In order to enter the Knesset, a squat rectangular building in the center of Jerusalem, you have to undergo thorough checks by a guard. Finally, the examination over, near a lobby decorated with pictures by Marc Chagall, we met a member of the legislative commission for foreign affairs and security.

"No one here would agree to surrender territories to the Palestinians and, consequently, have the border run 1,000 meters from the Knesset. If this were to happen, we would have not Scuds landing on us from a distance of 700 km, but guns firing on the legislature," the deputy claimed.

In response to our question as to whether he really considers this a realistic scenario, our interlocutor said: "Syria has 4,000 tanks, that is a reality. It has an army of 1 million, that is a reality." What is more, Israel's existence will still be under threat from Iraq and Jordan.

The deputy to whom we spoke is a member of the right wing of the ruling Likud bloc, but he is not one of the most bellicose members of the Knesset. There is, after all, still Rehavam Ze'evi, who was recently brought into the Cabinet as minister without portfolio. He does not advocate merely hanging onto the occupied territories, but also evicting the Palestinians from there. With that spread of forces in the legislature's leading grouping, one should not be surprised that U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's visit to Jerusalem failed to produce impressive results. Whatever the allies said in public, there was quite a clear watershed between them. President G. Bush said that a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict should be based on the "land for peace" principle. While Prime Minister Y. Shamir categorically rejects this principle.

But, be that as it may, the hot political season opened by Baker's trip has begun. People in Jerusalem have no

intention of keeping aloof, but nor have they any desire to give up virtually anything. People here talk frankly of their readiness for direct contacts with their Arab neighbors (which implies de facto recognition of Israel). As for the Palestinian problem, it is not being allotted top-priority significance. Dialogue with the PLO is ruled out, as is the creation of an independent state. The maximum that Israel is prepared to yield is elections on the territories and the subsequent granting of autonomy to the Palestinians.

Does that really suit them? Of course not. The problem is that the Palestinians' spokesman in the shape of the PLO can hardly expect sympathy from public opinion in the West and in Israel.

"Whereas by the middle of last year we had made slow, difficult progress toward accords with the PLO, now there can be no question of that. That is the Palestinians' real tragedy. After all, in welcoming Saddam Husayn's missile attacks on Israel, they became like people following a false prophet," we were told by Professor Shlomo Avineri, a prominent Labor Party man. "How could 'Arafat side with the bloody dictator? His actions remind of us of Jerusalem's mufti backing Hitler during World War II.... Yet political mistakes do not cost nothing. At any rate at this moment the PLO has ceased to be an acceptable partner for talks, even in the eyes of our liberal intelligentsia."

Part II

91UF0575A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

[Second and final part in a series on "Reports from Israel and the Occupied Territories. Procurators and False Prophets" by IZVESTIYA special correspondents Ye. Bay and V. Skosyrev; Jerusalem-Moscow dateline]

[Excerpts]

The Roman procurator Pontius Pilate did not like Jerusalem. If it were not bad enough that he got a headache every time he had to come there, he said that one could only expect to become a witness to the most unpleasant bloodshed there. It appears that Bulgakov's character was right about the last point.

Jerusalem simultaneously attracts by the grandeur of what its almost four millennia of history have embraced, and repels by the painfully acute anticipation of violence which has thoroughly permeated it in the past four decades. Numerous patrols in the eastern, Arab section evoke in the memory of one of us pictures once seen in Ulster, and in the memory of another, punitive raids through the streets of San Salvador. The very first details put us in a mood which we could not shake off. Soldiers stopped an Arab schoolboy; books from his satchel were tossed onto the pavement, and the boy pitifully explained himself under the barrels of assault rifles trained on him. Not far away, soldiers placed a completely gray old man who looked about 70 with his face

against the wall and made him spread his feet wide. They frisked him and shoved him aside in the end—get lost....

The painful impression of Jerusalem is exacerbated by the fact that a segment of the symbolic "green line" which separates the city into two implacable communities, Jewish and Arab, runs through the Old City where the Via Dolorosa meanders amid stone houses tightly pressing against one another—the Way of the Cross along which Christ was led to his crucifixion, where the Holy Sepulcher is found in one of the shrines, and a place symbolizing Golgotha is also located. [passage omitted]

Joshua Sagi, a retired general and currently a member of the Israeli parliament, told us that the Israeli Army is the most humane in the world, that plastic bullets were invented precisely in this country in order to avoid numerous deaths. According to the data of Palestinian organizations, in the three years of intifadah (since December 1987) more than 930 people have died at the hands of soldiers. According to data of the Israelis themselves, 641 local residents have been killed in the territory of Judea and Samaria (this is what the occupied territories on the West Bank of the Jordan River are officially called in Israel) and in the Gaza Sector. Most of these people were killed when protest demonstrations were dispersed, when stones were thrown at the soldiers, and when the latter responded by firing live rather than plastic bullets from assault rifles.

Innocents also die frequently. Every day, Jerusalem newspapers state with melancholy that the bloody score has increased in the past day by one or two persons. During our visit to this city, the JERUSALEM POST newspaper reported that Boan Moskovitz, a 32-year-old Israeli, encountered an artificial stone obstruction as he was driving his car on a highway toward the city of Bayt Lahm. Just in case, B. Moskovitz rolled down the window of his car and fired a burst from his M-16 rifle at nearby structures. A bullet hit 14-year-old Salam Musleh, who was in the kitchen of his house at the time and could not have been a threat to anyone. [passage omitted]

A fence densely twined with rolls of barbed wire begins at the edge of Bayt Lahm and runs along a highway that leads further into the occupied lands. One gets inside only by taking several narrow, stony, almost vertical "sheep" paths on which one has to look attentively where one steps. Every such "opening" is guarded by soldiers. We were in luck when we visited this locality. It was precisely the day when a curfew that had been in effect for two months was canceled in the Ad-Duheisha Palestinian refugee camp which the Israeli authorities believe to be one of the hotbeds of intifadah on the West Bank.

Mahmud Nidal, one of 8,000 inhabitants of Ad-Duheisha, hardly looks like an "extremist" and an "instigator of disturbances" based on outward appearances. In 1983 he graduated from the Kharkov Technical Institute and subsequently defended a dissertation at the chair of

analytical chemistry. He is a candidate of sciences; he is married to a Russian woman, and has two small children. In 1989 he moved back home from the Soviet Union.

Six months ago, Nidal's wife, Tatyana, was forced to move to the Soviet Union from here. To be sure, living conditions in the camp are difficult. This is their own house with three rooms, however, and they could live here no worse than in the Soviet Union if it were not for their dependence on the will of the Israeli military administration. Nidal explained that the Israeli military commandant of Bet Lekhem is the supreme echelon for the Palestinians. The commandant's office issues certificates in lieu of passports and drivers licenses; he registers the birth of a child, and letters may be mailed only through him. Nidal had to pay 200 shekels (about \$100) to extend the temporary residence permit for his wife every month. This lasted for six months; ultimately, a permanent permit was not issued. A regional military commandant may send someone to prison for five years for a curfew violation, and may make him pay a fine of 30,000 shekels. Nidal said that everything depends on the mood of the Israeli official; he may throw the book at you (if he has a headache), or pardon you.

Meanwhile, complying with the terms of the curfew means dooming your family to living from hand to mouth. Here, in the Ad-Duheisha camp, a state of emergency was imposed shortly before the Christmas break, almost three weeks before the war. The people were locked in their homes for two months; not only was going out into the streets forbidden, but even going onto the balconies of their own homes. The curfew was suspended for several hours only once every five days. At this point, all the women rushed to the city to do shopping in order at least to get some food. What did Nidal himself do in these months? He played cards with his friends or slept.

He said: "It was terrifying to see how Israeli soldiers roamed the deserted streets of the camp. They could come into any house and search it. Ten days ago, the soldiers killed a boy, my neighbors' son. He went to tend sheep, and a soldier on patrol who was driving by shot him with an assault rifle. He perched the rifle on the window of the car, took aim, and fired. What is this? Hunting people? A protest demonstration began in the camp the following day. The soldiers began to fire flare guns and bursts of tracer bullets into the air in order to disperse the demonstration. Had someone observed this scene he would have thought this was Baghdad during an air raid rather than a Palestinian camp...."

As recently as several months ago, Nidal worked at a local factory producing dyes. It closed when the crisis in the Gulf began, and he, a trained specialist who had brought an entire library with him from the Soviet Union, was left without a means of support. His is a typical story. When the prolonged curfew was imposed, about 30,000 Palestinians employed at local enterprises which are, as a rule, subcontractors for Israeli companies

lost their jobs. In addition, 110,000 Palestinians who previously commuted to Israel are also doomed to unemployment. The overall sum of losses in two months came to \$130 million. The independent Israeli newspaper HAARETZ wrote: "Comprehensive imposition of a state of emergency causes anger. As a result, moderate Palestinians may become extremists, and extremists may become even greater extremists."

Ibrahim Dakah, chairman of the large organization "Forum of Arab Thought," talked to us about "extremism on both sides." On the one hand, there are right-wing religious groups which are possessed by the idea of creating "Greater Israel" on Palestinian lands. On the other hand, there are calls for "a holy war" against Zionism by some PLO leaders and a nonrecognition of Israel's right to exist. The walls in all Palestinian cities on the West Bank—Ramallah, Bayt Lahm, and Nablus are covered with thick black crosses. This is how the Israelis destroy fresh inscriptions (old ones have long been washed off) which read: "Down with the fascist Zionist state" and "Long live Saddam Husayn the avenger," and which declare "Death to all Jews."

Extremism is also manifested in the increasingly frequent use of knives, Molotov cocktails, and sometimes bombs in recent months, instead of stones.

Extremism is manifested in reprisals against their own countrymen. During the days we spent in the area, the newspapers reported that the body of a hanged 35-year-old woman who was eight months pregnant had been found in the vicinity of the city of Nablus. The Palestinian organization Al-Saker al-Jarek ("The Wounding Falcon") claimed responsibility for the crime and stated that their victim had been executed by a people's court for cooperating with Israeli agents.

Such reprisals are not rare. According to the foreign press, almost 300 "collaborators" have been killed in the three years of the intifadah. Usually the "violators" are kidnapped by young people whose faces are covered with scarfs (in addition to "chatterboxes" who cooperate with the military, the "violators" include prostitutes and homosexuals who act counter to Islamic puritanism). Several hours or days later, having "interrogated" their victims, they dump mutilated corpses on the street or suspend them from lamp posts.

The fear of reprisals on the part of one's own countrymen is great, and we keenly felt it during the week we spent in the occupied territories. In the afternoon, the doors of numerous Arab shops and stores began to close in a hurry. By 1300 all window shutters were tightly closed until the next day. It would appear that they could have kept selling for a long time; why lose such profits? The tight-lipped merchants are evasive. The united intifadah leadership has ordered them to stop trading as a sign of protest against Israeli actions, or else... (but the protest affects the Arabs themselves!)

As we see it, this was extremism as well: On every occasion when an air-raid alarm was sounded on the

radio, meaning that yet another Scud had been launched against Israel, hundreds of residents of Ramallah, Nablus, and other cities went to the roofs of their homes, embraced each other and danced, exclaiming "Allah akbar!"—"Allah is great!"

The editor in chief of the Arab newspaper AT-TALIA, Bashir Barguti, explained this phenomenon as follows: "Israel has occupied our territories for 24 years. The power of Israel is the power of terror. The Israelis are mortal enemies of the Palestinians, and this is why any blow struck at them causes jubilation. I cannot share this feeling, but I do understand my people. People who were faced with inhuman conditions saw Saddam Husayn as their defender. He was the first one to raise so sharply the Palestinian issue, which the United Nations has been unable to solve for so many years. He dared to stand against American imperialism and world Zionism. The people saw that Israel could also be vulnerable."

This is the opinion of the head of a newspaper which holds a position supporting the PLO. What does Mahmud Nidal, the "Russified" Palestinian, think about this? His point of view is similar: Indeed, Saddam Husayn perhaps is not the man who should be a Palestinian hero. His occupation of Kuwait cannot be justified. The Palestinians are primarily concerned about their own fate. When we saw a ray of hope for a possible solution to our problem we supported the Iraqi leader to a man. The joy we experienced was not on account of these missiles hitting the houses where Israelis live. We were happy because it turned out that they may be hurt just as we are....

Many Palestinians from among those who are turning into "even greater extremists" told us that supporting the Iraqi regime inspired them to engage in the armed struggle, the only possible form of struggle. Quite the opposite, some believed that solidarity with Saddam Husayn had doomed their people to still greater suffering. After all, as a result of this, entire Palestinian settlements turned into closed ghettos. After the crisis began, the Palestinians stopped receiving approximately \$200 million from their relatives working in the Persian Gulf countries. A multi million stream of profits from exporting to Jordan the products of quarries and fruit gardens on the West Bank of the Jordan River stopped. After Jordan and the PLO sided with S. Husayn, the governments of the Gulf countries, primarily Saudi Arabia, as well as the Kuwaiti authorities, discontinued aid to the Palestinians and also closed the doors to all goods previously taken there through Jordan.

As hostilities proceeded in Kuwait and in the south of Iraq, the attitude of the Palestinians toward Saddam Husayn began to change right before our eyes. His standing deteriorated after the tyrant of Baghdad left his army in Kuwait to its own devices. Some of the journalists and university instructors began to say, albeit very confidentially, that Yasir Arafat had taken the wrong train, and that the rails it was rolling on ended at the edge of an abyss.

We would like to hope that the Palestinian leadership will learn a lesson from the events in the Gulf and will revise its policy in order to regain the confidence of the international community. After all, no matter how the military and political circumstances change, it is clear that the Palestinians will not be able to exercise their right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent state without the support of this community.

Unfortunately, even after the failure of the Iraqi adventure, figures come along who speak on behalf of the PLO but as a matter of fact act as Saddam Husayn's mouthpieces. Member of the PLO Executive Committee Abu Abbas proclaimed several days ago: "The number of armed attacks by Palestinians will increase abruptly very soon on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza sector, as well as in Israel itself." According to a report from Baghdad in the newspaper AL-WAFD, he said that "Palestinian detachments are ready for combat actions against Israel." Such statements merely provide new ammunition for Israeli "hawks" who maintain that Palestinians cannot be trusted, and that they will start laying direct artillery fire on the Knesset as soon as an independent Palestinian state is created.

False prophets and their allies continue to rally the Palestinians for "a holy war," the end of which may only be on Golgotha where an entire people may be crucified. Only the Palestinians, who unfortunately find themselves between a rock and hard place, can resolve the issue of the kind of leaders they want to have and who should articulate their interests.

Kurdish 'Rebel' Interviewed on Fighting in Iraq

LD0104193791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Interview with unidentified Kurdish rebel by Iraq correspondent I Rostovtsev; from the "Vremya" newscast; place and date of not given—comments are in Arabic with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Rostovtsev] These armed people call themselves peshmerga in Kurdish, which means partisans, or literally, those who sacrifice themselves. Today, they are participants in a people's revolution against the Iraqi authorities.

[Kurdish rebel] During the first two weeks, the greater part of the territory of Kurdistan was liberated from government troops. The struggle is not yet over; we want to rid our motherland of the dictatorial regime; we are striving for a democratic system for all Iraqis and for self-determination for the Kurdish people.

[Rostovtsev] What arms do the regular troops use against you?

[Kurdish rebel] They use against the people everything that there is in the Iraqi Army arsenals. This means chemical weapons and bombs and heavy artillery.

Women and children become the targets for haphazard firing. Not far from here, a hospital has been subjected to bombing.

[Rostovtsev] What types of weapons of mass destruction have been used here?

[Kurdish rebel] In the main, phosphorus shells, napalm, and bacteriological weapons.

[Rostovtsev] Are you confident that the rising will be victorious?

[Kurdish rebel] We are 100 percent confident. I think that Saddam Husayn's regime will fall very soon.

[Rostovtsev] They say that confidence in victory is already half way to victory. Nevertheless, Saddam Husayn's regime still has considerable forces. These people have no other choice but to struggle. They will go along the road they have chosen until the very end.

UN Security Council Talks on Gulf Reviewed

LD0204091991 Moscow TASS in English 0905 GMT 2 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations April 2 TASS—Delegates from non-aligned countries submitted to the U.N. Security Council on Monday a series of amendments to a draft resolution on the postwar settlement in the Gulf.

'Abdallah Salih al-Ashtal, a delegate from Yemen, said after consultations that the draft resolution prepared by the U.S. contained too many disputable elements.

He said the general outlines of the draft had already been agreed upon with the five permanent members of the Security Council. A whole number of points in the draft go beyond the U.N. Charter and the recognised standards of international law.

Among these problems, Al-Ashtal singled out the issue of the border between Iraq and Kuwait, which, under the draft resolution, should be defined under the 1963 bilateral treaty. This border exists only nominally and is not demarcated, however. He thinks that the issue as serious as this one should be settled between the two countries.

"If the border is established by the Security Council, this will be a dangerous precedent in the world, where there are many borders that generate disputes. Possibly, the two countries should apply to the international court," Al-Ashtal said.

Lifting sanctions is another important problem. The draft resolution envisages only a gradual softening of the economic embargo. The non-aligned countries call for lifting all restrictions in trade with Iraq as soon as possible. It is also important to set the exact terms for the

withdrawal of the coalition armed forces from Iraq. They now control approximately 20 percent of that country's territory, Al-Ashtal said.

Non-aligned countries have already prepared dozens of amendments to the draft resolution. Cuba alone proposed over 30 amendments to the text of the document. They modify significantly the draft resolution, which is a 20-page document.

Al-Ashtal questioned how many of them will be approved by the Security Council. But non-aligned countries are fully determined to press for the adoption of two or three amendments on the questions of borders, sanctions and terms for the withdrawal of the coalition forces from Iraq, he noted.

Security Council consultations will continue today. Many diplomats suppose that the resolution on the postwar settlement in the Gulf will be ready for adoption in two to three days.

Afghan Commander Cites Pakistani 'Interference'

LD0104210991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Report on an interview with Army General Mohammad Yusuf Asef Delawar, Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan by correspondent Boris Biragov in Kabul; date not given—Delawar speaks in Dari with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] The first of two dispatches from abroad in this bulletin says that the repelling by Afghanistan's Armed Forces of the opposition's offensive, supported by Pakistan, against the Afghan town of Khowst near the border with Pakistan continued for over two weeks. Over to our correspondent in Kabul, Boris Biragov:

[Biragov] In violation of the generally recognized norms of interrelations between states and the Geneva agreements, to the vicinity of Khowst from the territory of Pakistan reinforcements were constantly transferred to the rebels and direct military support was given. This enabled the enemy to create in the Khowst area an irretrievable superiority in manpower and equipment. Nevertheless, the rebels' first wave of attacks was repulsed by government troops. The enemy suffered great losses. It was not possible to repulse the second wave of attacks, despite the courageous resistance of the defenders of Khowst, who were cut off from the main forces of the Afghan Army.

Islamabad's open interference was the decisive factor which determined the outcome of the battle for Khowst—it enabled large rebel forces to consolidate and redeploy in the area of Khowst from Pakistani territory.

The direct participation in these rebel operations by regular units of Pakistan's army and militia was repeatedly pointed out in messages of Foreign Minister of the

Republic of Afghanistan Abdul Wakil to the UN Secretary General and also in the official protests by the Afghan side to Pakistan's Embassy in the Republic of Afghanistan.

[Begin Delawar recording] The redeployment and concentration of Pakistan's Armed Forces on the Afghan-Pakistani border in the area of Khowst is a fact. It is precisely after the completion of this redeployment that the offensive against Khowst started. The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan considers this offensive direct interference by Pakistan in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

We believe that the continuation of military actions threatens peace and stability in the entire region and the Government of Pakistan bears the responsibility for the most grave consequences of this aggression.

At present the fate of Khowst's inhabitants is giving rise to fears. (According to information and) as experience shows, the capture by the rebels of some or other Afghan towns is always accompanied by mass murders, robberies and rapes.

It is obvious that the world community must condemn Pakistan's aggressive actions against its neighboring country and take measures to prevent a repetition of such barbaric actions by the mujahidin toward Khowst's civilian inhabitants. [end recording]

East Europe

General Views East Europe Troop Withdrawals

LD0104132491 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—"The Soviet Union faithfully abides by its commitments to withdraw troops from East European countries," Major-General Vladimir Zhurbenko, deputy head of a main department of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, told TASS today in connection with the end of a regular phase of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East European countries. "Not a single Soviet tank has remained in Czechoslovakia by now," he pointed out.

More than 90,000 servicemen, 1,041 tanks, 2,902 combat armoured vehicles, more than 1,080 artillery systems and about 130 aircraft are to be withdrawn from the Western Group of Troops (Germany) in 1991, General Zhurbenko said.

"By April 1, almost 30 percent of personnel subject to withdrawal, more than 60 percent of tanks, 29 percent of combat armoured vehicles and 27 percent of artillery systems have already been pulled out since the beginning of this year," Zhurbenko emphasised.

In 1991, about 20,000 servicemen, 284 combat armoured vehicles, 165 artillery systems and 41 aircraft were planned to be withdrawn before June 30, 1991—the deadline for full withdrawal of troops—from the Central Group of Troops (Czechoslovakia).

"By April 1, more than a half of servicemen out of the number, 70 percent of combat armoured vehicles, 80 percent of artillery systems and 80 percent of aircraft have already been withdrawn.

"More than 15,000 servicemen, 214 tanks, 126 combat armoured vehicles, 115 artillery systems, and 116 aircraft are to be withdrawn from the beginning of the year to June 30 from the Southern Group of Troops (Hungary).

"By April 1, 36 percent of the personnel, 75 percent of tanks, 67 percent of combat armoured vehicles and 55 percent of artillery systems have already been withdrawn," the general said.

Zhurbenko voiced conviction that "the withdrawal of Soviet troops will be completed within the specified time-frame".

Hungarian Officials View Soviet Relations

Premier Speaks on Regional Ties

PM0104092591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Hungary-USSR"]

[Text] If Soviet troops are withdrawn from Hungary there "will be no—and, we hope, can be no—political problems" between the two countries, Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall stated in a speech at a forum of Hungary's agrarian intelligentsia. The country is also striving for friendly fruitful contracts, cooperation, and trade with all neighboring states, he stressed. Europe-wide integration is important for Hungary not only from the economic standpoint but also from the position of political and military security.

Minister Holds News Conference

LD2903213891 Budapest MTI in English 1909 GMT
29 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow, March 29 (MTI)—Hungary strives for settled political and economic relations with the Soviet Union, and we held talks in Moscow in this spirit, Hungarian Minister of Finance Mihaly Kupa said at his press conference in Moscow on Friday.

Kupa, who has been in Moscow since Thursday, termed his hitherto talks with directors of Soviet economic and financial life as 'correct and hard' ones.

In the interest of bridging the payments problems that hinder bilateral trade relations, the minister of finance

said the Hungarian side has initiated for the two countries to jointly turn to the European reconstruction and development bank, from whose sources two financial funds would be separated in Hungary and the Soviet Union, to finance bilateral export-import. The Soviet side has promised to investigate the proposal at the earliest possible date. In case of agreement, experts of the two sides could shortly work out the details of the joint proposal.

The Soviet side said revenues from Soviet exports to Hungary will be separated, with the exception of oil, and the amount would be used to finance imports from Hungary. A proposal was also raised, under which the two countries should set up a 'closed trading house,' through which certain goods could be marketed. Experts have been authorized to clarify the details.

Kupa said an agreement has been reached on setting up a 'strategic team,' to deal with long-term issues of bilateral economic relations.

Discussing the Soviet debts existing towards Hungary, the minister said the details of the agreement would be worked out by the end of April. The deadline of repayment is three to three and a half years.

Experts of the two countries will also determine, within a similarly short period, the details of the accounting agreement related to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. The relevant official documents are expected to be signed during the visit of Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall to Moscow. In this context, Kupa said he believes the end result of accounting will show a Soviet surplus, which the Hungarian side will naturally pay.

State Assembly Official Speaks

LD2903135691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Report on interview with Gyula Horn, chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the State Assembly in Hungary, by Budapest correspondent Sergey Sergey Shevikin—recorded, Horn speaks in Hungarian with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Shevikin] The man I am interviewing is Gyula Horn, chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the state assembly of the Hungarian Republic. He kindly agreed to tell what efforts the Hungarian legislators are ready to make to help the relations between our countries finally get onto their normal track.

[Horn] A few weeks ago I proposed to all the six parties represented in legislature to form a delegation to go to the USSR. We are now ready for meetings in the Supreme Soviets of the USSR, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and Ukraine. We see the way out of the situation which has arisen in simultaneously strengthening cooperation with the west and in creating

a system of bilateral treaties and agreements with neighboring states. Let me note here that there is no question of Hungary entering NATO's military organization. We are simply ready to demonstrate our striving to enter the world of civilized states while at the same time remaining devoted to the principles of universal good-neighborliness.

During the talks with the Soviet legislators we will undoubtedly raise the subject of economic relations between our countries. What is happening today is simply a catastrophe. The negative consequences of the collapse of economic links are being felt by both sides. Hungary, of course, is unable to facilitate the resolution

of the USSR's problems but we are able, even if just partially, to alleviate the burden of the shortage of foodstuffs and consumer goods.

In general, the reasons for tension in spheres of Hungarian-Soviet relations lie in the lack of political understanding of each other. Therefore, the foreign affairs committee of the Hungarian legislature decided to make the attempt to break down the walls of distrust. We hope for goodwill from our Soviet colleagues in response. The USSR Supreme Soviet has already confirmed its readiness to meet our delegation in mid-April. I believe that the talks in Moscow and Kiev will be useful.

Supreme Soviet

Resolution Urges S. Ossetia State of Emergency

PM0204115591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet resolution signed by A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in Moscow on 1 April: "On the Situation in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that despite the efforts undertaken by the USSR president and the country's leading bodies to settle the conflict and to stabilize the situation in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast has reached a critical point in recent days. The contingent of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops there is no longer able to ensure the observance of the USSR Constitution.

Considering the situation taking shape, the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees that:

1. In accordance with point 15 of article 127/3 of the USSR Constitution it be recommended to the USSR president that he introduce a state of emergency on the entire territory of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast using the USSR MVD internal troops forces.
2. The Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast soviet of people's deputies take all necessary measures to fulfill the USSR president's 7 January 1991 decree.
3. The USSR Prosecutor's Office and the USSR MVD form investigation groups to look into the crimes committed on the territory of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast during the conflict.
4. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers be asked to take immediate steps to provide the population of the autonomous oblast with food and medical supplies and to restore the activity of enterprises and organizations.
5. The USSR Cabinet of ministers form a government commission to determine the damage caused to the economy and sociocultural life of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast and to citizens.
6. The Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet and the leadership of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast take the necessary steps to create conditions for the refugees' return to their permanent homes.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Kremlin, 1 April 1991.

TASS Reports Supreme Soviet Proceedings 1 Apr

LD0104205391 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The joint session of the Soviet parliament adopted a decision today, recommending that the Soviet president declare a state of emergency in the South Ossetian autonomous region, using Soviet Interior Ministry troops.

This decision was taken to stabilize the situation in this autonomous region of Georgia, since the situation "has reached a critical point" there recently.

The all-Union parliament also adopted a law on the list of ministries and other central bodies of Soviet state administration, where the number of ministries and committees will be nearly halved.

Their total number will be 51, out of which 15 will be re-organized into state-run corporations, concerns, joint stock societies and other organisations of the market type during 1991- 1992.

Previously, the Soviet Government consisted of about 70 ministries and committees.

Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov delivered a report on payments of compensation to the population on the eve of Tuesday's price hike. He said that virtually all citizens received or would receive compensation in the next few days.

At the same time there are outstanding issues concerning nationwide ceiling prices for prime necessities, Shcherbakov continued. Leaders in the Baltic republics agreed with prices on non-edible goods, but they set higher prices for foodstuffs.

Prices for meat and butter will be higher in Uzbekistan and Turkmenia than the nationwide level. The deputy prime minister stressed that "the republics approved the nationwide scheme for the price hike and compensations".

He added that outstanding issues would be settled in the near future during consultations with the leaders of those republics.

It is expected that the joint session of parliament will on Tuesday examine the ratification of treaties between the USSR and Germany and a draft decision on the situation in agriculture.

All Treaties With Germany Ratified

LD0204124891 Moscow TASS in English 1217 GMT
2 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—The Soviet parliament, meeting behind closed doors today, overwhelmingly endorsed the last two treaties with Germany that had remained unratified.

They are the bilateral treaty on terms for the temporary stay of Soviet troops in Germany and their plan-based withdrawal and the intergovernmental agreement on transitional measures.

The Supreme Soviet legislature on March 4 ratified treaties on the final settlement with regard to Germany, on good neighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation, and on large-scale cooperation in the economy, industry, science and technology.

It has now approved the entire package of bilateral documents signed in September-November 1990 to provide the legal foundation for German reunification.

New Government Structure Approved

LD0104151191 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The number of all-Union ministries and committees will be nearly halved in the USSR. The Soviet parliament today adopted a law defining the structure of the Soviet Government.

The cabinet will have 51 all-Union ministries and committees, out of which 15 will be re-organised into state-run corporations, concerns, joint stock societies and other organisations of the market type during 1991-1992.

Previously, the government consisted of about 70 ministries and committees.

Addressing parliament, First Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev noted that "the law on the list of ministries may be reviewed, if need be," after the conclusion of a Union treaty, which will divide powers between the centre and the republics, and during the transition to market relations.

Doguzhiyev noted that the law provides for the participation of representatives from republics in the operation of the all-Union government.

"Important administrative bodies, including the State Council on Economic Reform and the Union-Republican Currency Committee, will tackle their issues only with the participation of representatives from republics.

"In addition, the law provides for their participation in the operation of the collegiums of all ministries," he stressed.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Opens Agro-Industrial Meeting 26 Mar

LD3003151391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Opening remarks by USSR President Mikhail S. Gorbachev to meeting of agro-industrial leaders in Moscow on 26 March—recorded]

[Text] Our credo, our agrarian policy, today fits within the framework of the country's current economic policy and proceeds from the fact that we must proceed via reforming property relations to opening up the potential in industry, in capital construction, in the agrarian sector, in the services sphere, and more. That is our approach. Thus, we are proceeding toward a mixed economy that will make it possible, in general, to put into operation powerful incentives both of labor collectives as a whole and of each individual producer.

That is the design. In this connection it is necessary to embark on various forms of economic management. I think that what the agrarian sector has already gone through during these years—and this movement started here even earlier than in other spheres, in particular after the May 1982 plenum and especially in the past few years—deserves the attention of the entire country to be drawn to it. We must reflect on what useful things we have obtained as a result of this search in our agrarian sector so that such things can be adopted by the country's farms, by collective and state farms, and by agricultural firms, but not only by agricultural firms, but others, too.

That is why we say our current agrarian policy enables collective and state farms, agricultural firms, peasant farms, private subsidiary holdings, orchards, and market gardens to show their worth. There are also other new forms where industry unites with agriculture. There are already zones where, without doing this, it will not work. I think the very best collective and state farms need to look for this very spring that today can stimulate the rural workers and compel them to look at things and at work on the land as something that concerns each person closely, so that each feels himself to be really the master, both considering that he is in charge of some one, and that he has at his disposal the means of production and the final results of the work. If all of this comes about, then a completely different situation arises.

We would very much like today, from this hall, where there are representatives of the whole country—our collective and state farms that already have experience in working under the new conditions and that have already accumulated some experience and that probably have various problems that make it difficult to make progress in this search, that holds them back—you should tell us about such things. Now we are acting in such a way as to have an opportunity to really unleash the potential of these various forms of economic management. In this connection, representatives of collective and state farms should not look askance at the new forms that are

appearing alongside them. On the other hand, I see many economic managers, many leaders of collective and state farms, who are making use of this experience within the collective and state farms and are trying on this basis to open up the potential of the farms.

Two years ago there were no independent peasant farms. There are now over 40,000 of them [figure as heard]. Their land holdings total over 700,000 hectares. The process is under way to set up various agricultural cooperatives; 8,500 of these have already been organized. At present, 18.5 million families are members of orchard and market-garden associations; some 103 million hectares of land has been put into their possession. This is almost 7 million more people than was the case before 1985. We have carried out this work. I should pay tribute here to the collective and state farms that have proved cooperative by giving more land to private subsidiary holdings when there was the demand, which have proved cooperative when there was demand and given townspeople plots of land for orchards and kitchen gardens. This is very good. There is an increase in production and people are engaged in useful labor. This is a sort of family adventure. The whole family is engaged in something worthwhile. It is a completely different environment.

These processes should not be looked at from the position of saying: Oh, they have taken two hectares or something else away from me. No, one's thinking should be based on state positions. After my speech in November that three to five million hectares of land should be handed over, there has been criticism in the press saying that, allegedly, cooperation is not being shown everywhere. Nonetheless, the process is under way. About 3 million hectares has already been gathered into the soviets' stocks. It is already possible to satisfy from these stocks those who are interested in working on the land and who are really capable of undertaking this. Three million, the first, lower figure of the two, has already been reached. I think that the possibility exists of taking this to the conclusion by the end of spring so that people are able to do something on this land this year and so that it is possible to find additional land to reach the 5 million hectares figure.

We must look calmly at this process as something normal. These are all elements of our agrarian sector and they are all dictated by life and collective. State farms should not only welcome it but also facilitate it.

Now I invite you to take the floor and to begin the exchange of opinions.

Gorbachev's Closing Remarks

LD3003162191 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Mar 91

[Closing remarks by USSR President Mikhail S. Gorbachev to meeting of agro-industrial leaders in Moscow on 26 March—recorded]

[Text] Moving on to a brief conclusion of this discussion, I think I should say this: Of course the current situation in the country, the political, social, and economic situation, and the state of legality and law and order, dictate to all of us—both the center and all the other echelons of power, both legislative and executive, and dictate, too, to our cadres working in different spheres of society—the need to implement, to use certain extraordinary measures, too. Here, as they say, there is nothing to be added and nothing to be taken away. Life is life, and in order to preserve our course, in order to continue these deep changes that we are implementing in society, and in order to make this course secure against extremes, we also have to have recourse to such measures. But the main direction has to be preserved—the direction that is linked with democratization, with economic and political freedom, with the initiative of people, with the introduction of powerful incentives for displaying the creative abilities of the person.

I am not going to enumerate all of this now. You know what I am talking about, for it is only using these ways and approaches that we will reach the goal we have set ourselves, give a second wind to the whole country, and achieve an improvement in the lives of people. But now it is necessary to resort to measures of the kind I have talked about. I consider it necessary to tell you this, because there are all kinds of false interpretations here.

On the other, there are demands along the lines of: We have had enough of this democracy; we have had enough of perestroika; we have had enough of these experiments, so to speak; we have had enough of it all—let's do as was demonstrated here, let's bring our fists down hard and put everything in its place, as it were. I see, nevertheless, from what you have been saying, that you are attached to the quest, to what is new. And the question arises here: Are order and firm authority and democracy mutually exclusive things? On the contrary, comrades! If there is no firm authority—and that is precisely our misfortune today—if there is no effective executive power, then democracy is not democracy. If the law does not operate, what kind of democracy is it without legality, without order, when everyone is free to do what he decides to do—especially those whose conscience, generally speaking, is out of kilter?

I think the results of the referendum and the active support—that powerful support from people through their participation and through the fact that 76 percent of those who took part in the referendum voting are in favor of preserving the Union—I see this first and foremost, comrades, as a sign that our people understand what this means for us. It is a Union that has been formed over centuries; it is the heritage of other generations. We have our own responsibility for this and for the immediate future. I think this is what people have voted for first and foremost. They understand that destruction—and we have quite a lot of those people in our country, including among the politicians—that would be the ruin and would hurt and touch upon the destiny of all people, every family, and every individual. This firm

opinion people have on the main question of the life of our state in this connection opens up possibilities for all of us, for the central authorities, for the republican and local authorities, and for all of our cadres. It opens up a new opportunity and new possibilities. We must take support from this, from the will of the people.

It is now very important to solve a number of practical tasks in our country. I would say that this is what should be given the greatest priority today. I put in first place the general question of not permitting the disintegration and collapse of our national economy, because these elucidations of relations vertically and horizontally and over and above that there have been added the lack of a solution to the wholesale prices question, which has had an effect upon the process of concluding contractual links and cooperation agreements among enterprises and has led to a situation which economic links have been weakened and broken. This is now resulting in great losses, with a slump in production. Some are trying to put it like this: perestroika, renewal, and the reforms do not take place without losses. Yes, that is always linked with painful manifestations of sickness, with manifestations that are transitional and difficult. Nevertheless, we have to bear in mind the fact that if this tendency, this negative tendency, the disintegration of economic links builds up, then it will deliver a blow against all our plans in general, both short- and long-term.

I would therefore say that our minimum program, and the Cabinet of Ministers is currently working on this, is aimed at the resolution of these urgent tasks to stabilize political, economic, and social life. We have to resolve the problems of the market and tackle this without delay. We must move in two directions here; you must work in two directions. Building up the supply of consumer goods is necessary. Here the agrarian-industrial complex is indispensable, because 70 percent of today's trade turnover is linked with it. Tomorrow the ration will be different, but that is how it still is today. Tomorrow we ought to have more goods of every kind, because we are unfolding the whole of our economy, including the defense sector, in the direction of satisfying the interests and the social needs of people. In other words, we are intensifying the social orientation of our economy.

But you are not going to solve things here solely by building up the production of goods. It is also necessary to bring incomes and the supply of goods into line, because it has to be said that in recent years we have had growth in output of goods of 25, 35, or 40 billion rubles at least last year. But the situation in the market has not only failed to improve, but has deteriorated, although during the last five-year plan the growth in goods amounted to 12 billion per year on average. Then incomes were kept under tough control. They did not break away from the growth in the end product, from the growth in the mass of goods. This distortion that has taken place today brings about the kind of situation where money...[changes thought] All this has led to the shortages, and shortages are accompanied by profiteering and these mafia-like manifestations—everything

that is produced by way of increase by the labor collectives goes out not via the channels of state or cooperative retail trade, but via other channels, and the individual is obliged to pay two, three, or five times the price. That is what is becoming of this. Today this is a state task of the highest priority. Therefore here, too, one has to move along the road of tough economic measures.

In this connection we arrived at the reform of retail prices. Without this it would be impossible. Having tackled wholesale prices—and procurement prices had changed, and today you say that they may already be failing to satisfy the needs of the collective and state farms—then naturally the issue of retail prices arose, too. The approaches on which we are resolving the issues are well-known.

Of course, the whole system of the agro-industrial complex—that is to say, the food question—is to be found within the framework of these urgent measures. If you are saying that I have, as it were, put it at the end—well this is a central issue. I do not think that we have to...[changes thought] We can agree with the fact that there is—as has been said here—some neglect, that the workers of the agrarian-industrial complex feel in a state of neglect, since this does exist with you, one should also have in mind the fact that farms that are represented here, which thanks to their own efforts—including efforts made over the past few years—nevertheless have results that are not bad, evidently because of this they do not represent the very worst block of farms, then one can imagine that no doubt that kind of feeling does exist among workers in the agro-industrial complex. But I have to say that our attention now is engaged—despite all the complexities and despite all the difficulties—in seeking both the material resources and solutions to financial problems and social questions which would help this most important sector of the economy to get its second wind. Without this the reforms will not work. One cannot hope that this political course, this course toward reforms, will be supported by the people if we have that kind of situation with foodstuffs and the goods market.

And that is why populists now—who, generally speaking, have nothing whatsoever to their name, no programs, nothing—the only thing they can do is skillfully exploit this tension and the fact that the patience of the people is already near the critical mark. The people are prepared to say: Let this course wait. Let these reforms wait. We will follow the person who will give us answers and resolve the questions tomorrow. There is nothing to be done here. They are capable of yielding to such calls, although no one is going to resolve all of these questions tomorrow. That is nonsense. They know that people are impatient, that they need things, that they are tormented by all these lines. They want to exploit this and achieve their own political goals. But they are people without serious programs. They are people with whom responsibility for the destiny of their country is something in very short supply. It is easy for them to...[changes thought] They find it easy to issue slogans, you know, and they try.

First and foremost they do not like being responsible for anything. They blame everything on those who are trying and seeking and endeavoring to resolve something in this difficult situation. But the agro-industrial complex must be helped today to stand on its feet and, moreover, move forward confidently and with broader strides.

About our present talk: Well, first and foremost, the data and the information that we have at our disposal shows that profound changes in land relationships and in forms of ownership and economic management are taking place in the countryside and in our villages. I have to say that during the five-year period a psychological barrier has been overcome and the processes are becoming more dynamic. People have already begun to act more confidently. Already we are talking not about individual leaseholders, not about individual people, not about one farmer or one farm. The process is already building up strength. That is the main trend, as they say. These positive changes are becoming stronger. This is the main thing.

In accordance with the decree that has been adopted and that I have mentioned, new steps are now being taken with regard to land reform. Furthermore, I would stress that in regard to land reform, we are talking about land reform and not about the reallocation of land, not about eliminating the collective and state farms. It is a question of sorting out all the land, of granting plots to all those who want them by the sowing season this spring so that they can get down to producing for themselves and, if they have surpluses, to send them to the market. In particular we are talking about the land that is not being used efficiently. It should be taken into the stocks of the soviets now. We have a lot of land of that kind, in many departments, and it should be taken first and foremost in places where it is simply not being used, where it is going idle, where it is neglected.

In that way I think we are acting correctly and responsibly. In no event whatsoever must we allow the kind of thing to happen where, you understand, extremist calls such as these are made to the townsfolk: Seize the land! Annex them from the collective and state farms! What kind of politics is that? But if we proceed once again with these methods without creating the economic, social, technical, and other kinds of prerequisites in order to stimulate both reorganization and reform within the collective and state farms themselves and to stimulate the creation of new forms of economic management, then we will once again repeat the sad experience of collectivization—only we will be doing it in reverse, in reverse.

I think this can only be called for by irresponsible people, who, generally speaking, have no desire to heed the voice of the workers of the countryside. In general—I have to say it once again—this is called for by people who want to pass themselves off as great revolutionaries. I have to say to you: These are Stalinist ways. These are Stalinist ways, only from different standpoints, but once again making guinea pigs out of people. Can one really treat

people like that, especially people who live in the countryside? You cannot treat people like that, certainly not those who live on the land, who know what the labor of the peasant is. I see that this is pure political intrigue. I come out openly against it. This could mean large losses for society, and not only for the countryside, even though for losses in the countryside are losses for the whole country.

At the same time, I am a resolute supporter of the idea of reforming property relationships in the countryside. I am in favor of a multiplicity of forms of economic management in the countryside. I am resolutely in favor of that. We know that just two or three years ago arson was being committed against plots belonging to farmers and leaseholders, against leaseholders. At one time people committed arson against the collective farms. Today this is not taking place, but I am not going to say that everyone has moved so actively along the road of reforms. Each step in this area is achieved with difficulty, with difficulty. Therefore, I welcome all those who are really worried about the processes and who are interested in supporting the countryside and the peasantry in the search for new forms of economic management. I am with them; I champion them. And not only those who are sitting in this hall, but those outside the hall, too; and not only those in the countryside, but those in the towns who come out and those among the scientists, public figures, journalists, and literary figures who are sympathetic with these searches and who help these searches and support them in every way, with encouraging words. I am with them. But I am against the adventurers and extremists in this matter. A great cause of the people cannot be conducted in that way, you understand, breaking the people and the country over one's knee.

I think that this discussion that has taken place also shows that the way out is to be found, the way out for our countryside is to be found in a radical change to production relationships within the farm, which would resolve this most simple of questions and put an end to the alienation of the person from the land, from the means of production, and—what is the main thing—from the end results of his labor. It is a simple formula. There are various approaches. Therefore, let these new relations be built upon leasing principles, on cooperative principles, on family principles of economic management, on the rights of collective coproprietors, on people's property, the agro-firm, by all means! Let it be a synthesis of the countryside and industry. I have to say that there are regions where nothing can be done without uniting our agrarian sector with industry. There are. In our non-chernozem zone, in the Vladimir and Kirov Oblasts, and in other areas they have begun to do this. I welcome this, because what preceded this was the way we developed forces of production in this zone, when as a consequence everyone went off into the towns. The countryside was depopulated and neglected. The land became overgrown. Six million hectares of land became overgrown with forest. Now it really has to be understood that without

uniting the efforts of the land workers and the industrial people, we are not going to be able to solve anything in a serious way. No. This too has a right to exist.

No one can dictate how things have to be run. The main thing is just to go and look for the sole effective form that will correspond to this zone and—the main thing—be in keeping with the opening up and stimulation of the person. Stimulate his entrepreneurial bent, his economic initiative. That is what is needed. If someone wants to say that the agro-combine, the agro-firm, the agro-industrial consortium, the agro-trading firms are, so to speak, a kind of excessive concentration—I do not think that that is the case. Perhaps there are places where that is how things have happened. That it is not justifying itself, and there are certain unresolved issues that generally have made the situation even more serious. But, in principle, if economic relations have been well thought through here, if wide independence has been granted to all participants in these forms of economic management in the countryside, then I have to say that enormous potential has been laid down in these forms of economic management, when a person is responsible for everything from the field to the end product.

There they have precisely defined interrelations, their own bank. They depend totally on the final result. This is good. Everything that gives free rein to initiative, economic initiative, for the collective and for the individual has the right to exist.

We welcome all forms of property, all forms of economic management. There is one thing that I have not mentioned, but I would like to say, in particular, that it is necessary to give all sorts of incentives to private subsidiary holdings. In the first place, this has always been a boon to the peasant family, an economic and a social boon, even though it is also a burden. For the education of rural children, it is of vast importance. I know this from my own experience. I consider it simply essential and necessary not to omit this point about the private subsidiary holdings. All the more so since, while collective and state farms are being restructured, while peasant farms are being created, and while agro-industrial firms are gathering strength, today private subsidiary holdings, with the support of certain mutually advantageous contract relations with collective and state farms, can immediately place, can immediately deliver at the pithead, to use miners' terminology, the produce that we need today. All of this must be used.

So, this is democratism of land relations, democratism of transformations in the countryside. Do not let these newly hatched extremists claim that they, from their democratic positions, are promoting land reform. This is not democracy; this is extremism and coercion. This is lack of any respect for the people who live and work on the land.

The question arises: Will there be a return to the past? Have the efforts not been in vain of those who are sitting here and of those who accompanied you along this road

of transformations? There will be no return to the past, comrades. Yes, today both the collective and state farm and the agricultural firm have not yet received the freedom that they should receive, but we are moving toward this. We want this; we thought that this was simple; we just had to utter the word and freedom would immediately appear. But in order for this freedom to exist, very much must be done in the country. How can the collective and state farms be free, and how can the state go in for this if there is no market for the peasant, who wants to earn more and then spends this money, and thus for this to result in a new house and some sort of new goods, durables or expendables, and so on. If these do not exist, then that is the end of the matter. If there is no market for equipment, for the means of production, that, too, is no good. That means that until this is created, the state should seek and have recourse to such forms in order to use them to guarantee to some extent this flow of agricultural produce.

All the same, we are moving in the right direction. We are moving away from administrative forms, moving away from issuing commands. But I cannot yet say that we have fully arrived at implementing the slogan that Lenin uttered at one time: Do not dare to issue commands. This was said with regard to the peasants. No. We want to do this. We have announced this. But as yet we have not achieved this. We must move toward this.

Your experience convinces one that the more one gives of economic freedom and economic responsibility, and especially the freedom to dispose of the final results of their labor—this is the main thing—the better and the more strongly incentives will work.

The theme has been raised here of equivalent relations among the agro-industrial complex, agriculture, and other sectors of the national economy. Comrades, bear in mind, you and I here are not on different sides of the barricades. We understand this. If equivalent relations are not maintained among the spheres, and if the process of drawing the living standards of town and countryside closer together is not achieved, then we will be in a difficult position all the time as regards foodstuff.

Furthermore, 100 million are connected with agriculture, with the agro-industrial complex. That is over one-third of the country's population. Therefore, from this point of view, this is large-scale politics, these relations between the town and the countryside, between our workers and peasants. This is the foodstuffs question, the question of land, a question of the present, a question of contemporary life and life in the future. This is a cardinal question of our state policy. We will give it serious thought, I assure you. The president and the cabinet will give it serious thought. We are now preparing and discussing these new approaches so as to maintain these equivalent relations at the appropriate level.

As for the question of resources for the countryside, this is a question that it is necessary to decide how to resolve.

Today our resources are in the republics. There construction, all construction organizations, have been transferred to the republics. Everything is there. The cement industry, the building materials industry is there. Everything is in the republics. That means that, evidently, we need to pay attention to these questions so that they appear for general discussion in the Council of the Federation and so that on this subject a program should be developed so as to reflect a common position that would provide guidelines for the authorities in all republics.

I think that this worries you. I heard this before this meeting, too. It is confirmed by the present meeting, too. We will give serious thought to this.

I am concluding our meeting. Thank you once again for your active participation in it, for your concrete deeds. What we need now are concrete deeds. I wish you all success.

PRAVDA Version of Remarks

PM2903190091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Mar 91 First Edition pp 1,2

[TASS report on 26 March meeting in Moscow: "For New Forms of Economic Management in the Country-side, for the Priority of the Agro-Industrial Complex: Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and Leaders of Kolkhozes, Sovkhozes, and Agro-Industrial Enterprises Which Have Switched to New Forms of Management"]

[Excerpts] As already reported, on 26 March M.S. Gorbachev met with agro-industrial complex workers who have switched to new forms of economic management. Opening the meeting, he said:

We have invited to the discussion representatives of those kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and processing enterprises which have already done quite a lot to embark on new forms of labor organization and incentives and to tap the potential contained in those farms.

A meeting with such resourceful and creative people is particularly valuable because peremptory calls for the destruction of kolkhozes and sovkhozes are being expressed very often nowadays both in the press and at various political rallies and meetings. I think that these statements are not only ill-considered but also irresponsible.

Our credo, our entire present-day agrarian policy fits into the contemporary economic reform and proceeds from the premise that we must achieve a new level of development both of industry, capital construction, the agrarian sector, and the services sphere via the reform of property relations. That is our approach.

We are moving toward a mixed economy, which will make it possible to set in motion powerful incentives both for entire labor collectives and for each individual production worker. That is the plan. Hence the need to develop different forms of economic management.

Our present agrarian policy gives kolkhozes, sovkhozes, agro-industrial firms, peasant holdings, and personal subsidiary plots an opportunity to actively show what they can do. There are other new forms, too, in which industry unites with agriculture and good results are also being achieved. In brief, a very real search is in progress for new methods of economic management on a nationwide scale.

And if anyone says that he does not need all these innovations and searches, I must strenuously disagree with him. Any farm, even the best one, needs to find those mainsprings which would give the rural worker an incentive today and would prompt him to regard work on the land as his sacred cause so that he really becomes the master not only of the means of production but also of the end results of labor.

So if work proceeds that way everywhere a completely different situation emerges. Thus the first thing that I would like to hear from you is—what have you achieved? The second thing—what are your wishes and proposals?

Of course, what you want to hear now is: How is the agrarian sector going to develop in the future? How is its priority to be ensured?

The processes launched in the agrarian sector and in its relationship with other sectors of the economy have had the result that the profit of the public sector has risen 2.8 times since 1985 to reach 57.7 billion rubles [R]. The profitability level of kolkhozes and sovkhozes has reached 36 percent. This is tremendous progress. It has been achieved thanks to the labor of peasants and of those people who lead kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other forms of economic management in the agrarian sector. And, of course, here one can see the definite line of party and state policy. I must say that what was proclaimed at the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum on agrarian policy has subsequently inspired the activity of state organs. And much has been done in that respect.

The profit achieved last year, which was a difficult year, was almost R8 billion higher than in 1989. If you consider that kolkhoz and sovkhoz debts of R100 billion have been written off, you will understand that this greatly changes the economic situation in the countryside.

I know that you are worried today by the rise in wholesale prices in our industry and the new coefficients in construction. This worries us, too. The countryside's priority begins with the guarantee of equivalent exchange between the agrarian complex and other spheres of the national economy.

The USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food, newly created at your request, is now working on that question. Attached to the ministry there is a special group combining specialists and scientists who are drafting proposals for the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Undoubtedly direct adjustments will be needed through the raising of

purchase prices. I am expressing this viewpoint now in preliminary form for the time being.

Thus clearly we will have certain volumes of output which the state will order from rural producers, with the provision of corresponding guarantees. Then everything produced above the state order may, as in the past, be sent straight to the market. In this way it will be possible to achieve the kind of incomes which would meet or balance out the expenditure which may increase because of price changes in dealings with industry. I believe that it would be even better if this vital mechanism were used to give extensive opportunities to economic managers to make decisions. So, you have an order, a contract with the state—that is what society needs—then you can increase production. The more you produce the more of an end product you will have in your hands and the more flexibility you have.

We should consider together how to combine efforts and find the vital mechanism for regulating reciprocal relations between the countryside and the city. Because everyone must understand: If that mechanism is not found and if the most important sector of our economy finds itself in a difficult economic position again, then all our transformations will come to naught.

The agrarian sector must feel that it is not being ignored by society. Society cannot leave it unattended or unsupported. That simply cannot be tolerated.

Spring is on the way. How is the countryside going to continue living? Where are the spare parts and fuel to come from? The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has examined all these questions. As for fuels and lubricants, decisions have already been adopted. The problem now is to deliver them to consumers promptly. The whole process designed to ensure that agriculture has at its disposal all it needs for the increased volume of spring work, given that much work was left undone in the fall, is under control.

As for fertilizers, farms will receive at least as much if not more than last year. Now you will say: Where are those fertilizers? We do not see anything. I am telling you what the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has decided and what will be implemented. That applies to spare parts, too. All these questions are in themselves complex but they have been aggravated still further by the adverse effect of the miners' strikes. Decisions are now being adopted which should ease the situation for you, too. It is necessary to use all the potential of the republics, krais, and oblasts and local industry here. Let us not make a secret of this—past experience could serve us well. What I mean is that when it was necessary industrial enterprises in cities and industrial centers always came to the aid of farms. Today, too, it is necessary to provide good assistance to kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and our peasantry to make sure that machines are prepared and that we cope successfully with the vast amounts of work.

Returning to the theme of our talk, I want to stress: Let each form of economic management reveal its potential and prove its advantages. We still have to find out what our modern kolkhozes and sovkhoses are really capable of if they are given the opportunity to manage their affairs really freely and properly for the first time in so many years.

The agro-industrial firms functioning most successfully today are those in which the countryside is participating actively—and, also, private farmers, kolkhozes, and cooperatives. Firms also include processing enterprises, storage facilities, and organizations engaged in the sale of output.

The important thing now is to enable the potential of the different forms of economic management to develop. And the representatives of kolkhozes and sovkhoses should not look askance at those new forms which are appearing alongside them. On the contrary, the most farsighted economic managers and many kolkhoz and sovkhos leaders have begun to use these forms on their farms and this is enabling them to realize their potential more fully.

Two years ago there were no autonomous peasant farms. Now there are over 47,000. Over 700,000 hectares of land have been allocated to them. Various agricultural cooperatives are in the process of being formed. Some 8,500 have already been organized. Some 18.5 million families are now members of horticultural and truck farming comradeships, which own 1.3 million hectares of land [figure as published]. This is almost 7 million more than in 1985. We carried out this work together with you. And here I must pay tribute to the many kolkhozes and sovkhoses which helped those who had decided to set up personal subsidiary plots. They helped city dwellers and allocated land for orchards and truck farms. This is very good. Output is increasing, people are engaged in useful labor, and working families are becoming stronger. Thus people should not look at these processes in terms of having had another two hectares "snatched" from them. No, this must be approached from the state's position.

The land reform is under way now. There have been many critical comments on that score in the press: It is not universally welcomed. But nevertheless, the process is going on. Around 3 million hectares of land have already been allocated to the soviets' fund and that fund provides an opportunity to satisfy the demands of those who are interested in work on the land and who really have the ability to tackle it. I think that it is possible to achieve 5 million hectares this spring. This is dictated by life. Both kolkhozes and sovkhoses should not only welcome this useful and worthwhile cause but assist it, too. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev spoke in conclusion. The discussion that has taken place, he said, shows convincingly that workers in our agriculture and the entire agro-industrial complex, while demanding that attention be paid to their

own problems, are concerned about how to help the country, how to give the people more food and good produce as quickly as possible. They are also seeking new ways of resolving this task.

Our peasantry and workers in the agro-industrial complex are people with great reserves of patriotism, industriousness, and responsibility. Despite all the difficulties, they do not waver, they do not vacillate, but they work solidly on the problem of meeting people's urgent needs. That is the most important thing.

I think the present political, social, and economic situation in the country and the state of law and order and the rule of law dictates to all of us—both the center and other echelons of legislative and executive power and all our cadres working in various spheres of the economy—the need for measures of exceptional importance. Here there must be no beating around the bush, as the saying goes. Life is life, and in order to maintain our course and continue the profound changes in society, it is necessary to defend that course against extremes.

But the main direction must be maintained. This is democratization, economic and political freedom, people's initiative, the introduction of powerful incentives to unleash man's creative capabilities. Only in this way and with this approach will we progress toward the goal we have set ourselves—to give the entire country a new lease of life and succeed in improving people's lives.

Here the question arises: Order, a firm power, and democracy—are these things mutually exclusive? On the contrary, comrades. If you have no firm, effective executive power, and that is precisely our trouble today, then your democracy is no democracy.

When everyone is free to do everything that comes into his head—especially people who, in general, are not much troubled by conscience, and it seems we have a good many such people—then they can turn back the processes of democratization, they can distort and discredit them.

Democracy needs the rule of law and an effective executive power—all these are, in fact, elements of a normal society.

The referendum results, the active and powerful support of people who came out in favor of preserving and renewing the Union, confirm that our people understand that the point at issue is something precious to the entire people. It is a country that has grown up over the centuries. It is the heritage of very many generations. It is also our responsibility for the immediate future.

The firmly expressed will of the vast majority of voters on this most important question opens up new opportunities for constructive activity by central, republic, and local authorities and for our society as a whole. We can and must rely confidently on the people's will, elevated to the status of law.

It is now very important to resolve several practical tasks that should take priority today. I would put this key question first: preventing the disintegration of economic ties. Confrontation in both the vertical and the horizontal chains of communication will lead to nothing good.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is working on a minimum program oriented toward resolving urgent tasks that should stabilize economic, social, and therefore political life. Economic ties must be restored and maintained so that collectives can work, earn money, and maintain their own lives and the lives of the whole of society at a certain level. Without this, nothing else is possible. That is the first thing.

Second, we must urgently tackle the problems of the market.

We must boost consumer goods production. And here the role of the agro-industrial complex is unique. Some 70 percent of trade turnover is associated with this complex. First and foremost, food production must be increased.

More industrial goods must also appear in the near future. We are focusing our entire economy, including the defense sector, on people's social interests.

But the problem cannot be resolved solely by boosting the production of goods. It is necessary to bring the money supply into line with the supply of goods. In recent years we have already achieved annual increases in goods amounting to R25-25 billion or even R40 billion and more, but the situation on the market, far from improving, has deteriorated. And all because income was not under strict control. This distortion has led to shortages, accompanied by speculation and mafia phenomena. And that is why here too we must follow the path of tough economic measures.

In this connection we have embarked on the price reform. We cannot do without it. You know the approach we have adopted in tackling it, the materials have been published. Prices must reflect the real economic process.

It is through these means that the market can and should be stabilized.

The populists, for their own political purposes, are speculating on the tension, on the fact that the people's patience has reached crisis point.

They proclaim their slogans loudly but refuse to take responsibility for anything, and they blame everything on those who are trying really to resolve something in this difficult situation.

The agro-industrial complex must be given help today so that it can move forward. Then many of the questions that are worrying our people today will be cleared up.

Today's discussion shows that profound changes are taking place in the countryside in land relations and forms of ownership and economic activity. In five years a psychological barrier has been broken down, the processes are acquiring dynamism, and people have begun to act more confidently. That is the main thing.

In accordance with the decree adopted, new steps are now being taken in land reform.

It is not a question of abolishing kolkhozes and sovkhozes, but of reaching an understanding with all those who want land. It is necessary, in time for this year's spring sowing, to make plots available to all who so wish, so that they can generate produce for themselves. And if there is a surplus, they can send it to market.

And it is first and foremost a question of the land that is not being rationally used. This land must be taken into the soviets' fund, we have much of this land, under many departments. First and foremost, where it is not being used, where it is neglected, it must be taken over and put into safe hands.

But in no circumstances must the politickers be allowed to go to the city dwellers with their extremist demands: Seize the land, annex it from the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Only irresponsible people can make such demands, people who totally refuse to listen to the voice of very many rural workers, yet who pass themselves off as great "revolutionaries." These are akin to Stalinist ways.

At the same time I would like to stress once again—I am a resolute advocate of the reform of ownership relations in the countryside, and of a diversity of forms of economic management. Working in this direction is not an easy ride. We know that two or three years ago there were arson attacks on private farms and leaseholdings, as there used to be at one time on kolkhozes. Today this does not happen. But I will not say that everyone has embarked actively on the path of transformations. Every step is hard. Therefore I greet all those who are committed to supporting the countryside and the peasantry in the quest for new forms of economic management. I am on their side, I support them.

And not only in the countryside, but in the city too. I am on the side of those scientists, public figures, journalists, and writers who sympathize with this endeavor and support it in action and in words. I am on their side, but against adventurers and extremists of every kind. You cannot approach the people's great cause in this way, cutting off the people and the country at the knee.

Let new relations be based on lease or cooperative principles, on the basis of family management, on the principles of collective property owners or people's ownership. Agro-industrial firms—good luck to them too. Let it be a synthesis of the potential of the countryside and industry, and I must say that there are regions where

nothing will be achieved without that. In our nonchernozem zone—in Vladimir and Kirov Oblasts and others—they have started to do this. And I welcome this, because the countryside is depopulated and neglected. Millions of hectares of land are overgrown with forest. So it is necessary really to understand that without pooling the efforts of farms and industrialists nothing can really be resolved.

No one can dictate to you how to do your job. The main thing is to find a form that meets the specific conditions of each zone and stimulates people's labor, their entrepreneurial capability, their economic sense—that is what we need.

I wish to stipulate particularly: It is necessary also to provide every possible incentive for personal subsidiary plots. In the first place, this always produces both economic and social benefits for a peasant family, although it also means more work. It is also of enormous significance in raising children in the countryside. I know that from my own experience, I went through all that.

Therefore I would consider it necessary also to devote attention to personal subsidiary plots. Especially for the time being—while the kolkhozes and sovkhozes are being restructured, while peasant farms are being set up, while agro-industrial firms are getting under way—today personal subsidiary plots, with support and with certain mutually beneficial contractual relations with the kolkhoz or sovkhoz, could immediately generate the produce we need. All this must be exploited.

That is what democracy in land relations means. That is what democracy in transformations in the countryside means. And let us not allow the newly emerged extremists to pass off their wishes as reality, as if they were the only ones to speak from a democratic standpoint and promote land reform.

The question posed is this: Will there be a return to the past, and are the efforts of those who have embarked on the road of transformations in vain? There will be no going back!

True, today the kolkhoz, the sovkhoz, and the agro-industrial firm have not yet received the freedom they should have. But we are getting there. If there is to be freedom, there is much that must be done. Because how can a kolkhoz, or a sovkhoz, or a state be free, if there is no market? But since there is not yet a market in the means of production, the state must resort to measures enabling it to guarantee the production of agricultural output, while the peasant who wants to earn a bit more should be given the opportunity to use the money he earns. To acquire a new house, new consumer durables, and so forth.

We are moving in the right direction, we are leaving behind the edict system. But we have not yet fully achieved the realization of the slogan that Lenin put forward in his day: "Do not venture to issue edicts!"

After all, he said that in relation to the peasant. If this is what we want, we must move in that direction.

And our experience shows that the more economic freedom and economic accountability there is, in particular, the freedom to dispose of the end results of your own labor—the stronger the motivation for efficient economic management.

The topic of relations between the agro-industrial complex and agriculture and other sectors of the national economy has been raised here. You and I are not on different sides of the barricades here. Naturally, unless fair relations are maintained among spheres of economic activity, unless living conditions in the countryside move closer to those in the city, we will not get out of the grave situation that has arisen.

More than one-third of the country's population is directly involved with agriculture. And from that viewpoint the strengthening of relations between the city and the countryside, between workers and peasants, is big politics. It concerns the food question, the future of our countryside and our land, the question of the people's entire present and future life. So the reform of agrarian relations is a very important avenue of state politics. The president and the Cabinet of Ministers will resolutely tackle the problems of the countryside and the agro-industrial complex. These problems must also be discussed together in the Federation Council, so as to arrive at an action program reflecting a common position and providing guidelines for the organs of power in all the republics and at the center.

Once again I thank you, esteemed comrades, for your concrete action. I wish you all success.

Gorbachev Examines Work on Anti-Crisis Program

*LD0104200191 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT
1 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today examined the Soviet cabinet's work on an anti-crisis programme.

During the discussion, Gorbachev made observations about the character and the contents of the document. He considered it expedient to end work on the draft programme in a week.

The cabinet also informed the president about its work connected with increases in retail prices for consumer goods and services.

Pavlov Addresses Automobile Workers 1 Apr

*LD0104203191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Apr 91*

[Excerpts] Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, USSR prime minister, visited the Likhachev works today and spoke to representatives of the work collective of this enterprise.

Our correspondent Valeriy Kiosa, who is in our studio, will report the details. Over to you.

[Kiosa] The meeting started this morning with the tour of the serial models which this well-known works produces and models which are yet to be produced. Then several buildings of the works were visited. [passage omitted]

In a brief conversation with correspondent Valentin Sergeyevich, Pavlov stressed that it is not the compensation system that the government considers important, but a new wage system. He also stressed that the most important thing at present is to provide agriculture with equipment. That is why he came to the Zil works, one-third of whose output is for agriculture.

A meeting with representatives of work collectives took place in the afternoon. I would single out the following points from the prime minister's speech at this meeting: He thinks that the instability of the sociopolitical situation in the country has led to the economic slump advancing further than expected, for purely economic reasons, so to speak. Moreover, as he put it, the economy has become the hostage of politics. Hence, the disruption of the entire national economic complex is increasing. May I remind you that this topic has been expressed many times in the speeches of our prime minister. He says that our economy can be considered strong only when it operates as one single complex.

Of course, the question of miners' strikes was raised. Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov said that talks with miners' representatives will take place tomorrow. We, he said, are ready to hold them, we are ready to examine issues of conditions of miners' work and wages, but the country needs coal in return. According to Pavlov, we have already lost about 6 million tons of coal and about 3 million tons of rolled iron.

Here is the final point I would like to note: The press and other sources have mentioned the following issue many times: whether the new cabinet has a program. In regard to this, Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov stressed again that we need to devote particular attention right now to technical re-equipment of base industries of our economy, and this is the issue of major state programs. He noted at the same time that enterprises should not be the property of the Union, or the republics, or any other territorial formations, but should belong to their work collectives, that development should proceed along the lines of forms of collective property. The most important task, which the government will tackle literally in the forthcoming days, is to provide for agricultural work and for material aid to agriculture, without which, he said, we will not be able to tackle many other tasks in the near future.

Further on Pavlov Factory Visit

LD0104224991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 1 April

carries a 5-minute recorded report by correspondent S. Medvedev on the 1 April visit to the Moscow Zil factory by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. Video shows Pavlov touring the Zil works, accompanied by officials. At one stage he is seen speaking with a woman worker. The employee says: "You know, I've been working here for thirty years and our pay is very low, very low. It's good for nothing. There are temporary workers on the conveyor. According to the staffing, forty people are stipulated. There are constantly ten."

Another worker says: "Two hundred and nineteen rubles a month."

Pavlov asks: "Is that the average?" An employee responds: "That's the average. It's effective time."

Pavlov then asks: "Why don't they produce work, then?" A worker answers: "Well, how is work to be produced? There are no spare parts."

Pavlov rejoins: "Well, now you are standing around." The worker counters: "Yes, we are standing around. There are no condensers, no evaporators, no grills."

After the plant tour ends, Medvedev asks Pavlov: "Many people who took part in the meeting with you today said that the compensation payment and pay does not satisfy them."

Pavlov answers: "Here, today, it is necessary to speak not about compensation payments but about pay. I personally, for example, am very satisfied by the fact that it is precisely the workers, the experienced workers especially, who very cleverly expressed the viewpoint not about compensation payments, but that what is necessary is fair pay for work, and that they would like to earn. From this viewpoint, the leadership is ready, and evidently the government should also be ready, to work in this direction, that is, to remove everything which prevents increasing production and pay."

Medvedev reports that Pavlov spent almost six hours in the shops, and then met representatives of Zil workers. Video shows Pavlov addressing a meeting:

"I have to. I will tell you quite frankly that we are counting on the consumption of bread falling in our country after increasing prices. Why? Because, well, our country, well, what does it consume? Well, just take a look at yourselves. What do you think? Who of you eats 138 kg of bread? Just show me that person. You won't eat 138 kg of bread, I guarantee you. It is physiologically impossible to do this. But that is consumption. That is, it either goes to feeding livestock, but, we feel that, or, secondly, excuse me, it goes onto the rubbish heap. In exactly the same way, I can give you a one hundred percent guarantee that not a single person sitting in this hall will eat 44 kg of sugar, unless it's in liquid form."

"In general, does the cabinet have any kind of program? The first, and fundamental issue, of which I have already spoken, but which perhaps not everyone has heard or read, is that we are convinced of one thing, that we have

to carry out a structural restructuring and technical retooling of our national economy, of its base industrial sectors, first and foremost. People are starting to criticize us, and say that we are against the market. We are not against the market. We are not against consumer goods. But, after all, before making a refrigerator, you need metal, and you also need plastics, and you need motors. Only then does a consumer good appear".

Further on Pugo Remarks on 28 Mar Rally

PM0204122591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 2 Apr 91 First Edition p 6

[Interview with USSR Minister of Internal Affairs B.K. Pugo by TASS correspondent B. Shestakov; place and date not given: "Pugo: I Hope for Common Sense"]

[Text] Life in Moscow seems to be beginning to return to normal following the thousands-strong unsanctioned rally. At the TASS correspondent's request, its results are summed up by USSR Minister of Internal Affairs B.K. Pugo:

We have already expounded our viewpoint to the Union Supreme Soviet. An official report has also been prepared with a detailed analysis of the events, including the offenses which occurred 28 March. The main question is: Why did the country's leadership ban mass actions? For a large number of demonstrations has taken place in the capital before and, fortunately, they passed without incident.

But the 28 March rally—and this is not concealed by the organizers themselves—was in fact designed to put very strong pressure on the opening Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputies. The organizers consider this acceptable. But from my viewpoint pressure runs counter to common sense. A deputy is responsible only to his own constituents and must express their viewpoint at the congress and not yield to any emotions. The decisions that are adopted must be weighed and reflect the position of the majority of the population in the district which this deputy represents. Is it possible to speak of a free expression of will if deputies are subjected to moral, psychological, and sometimes even physical influence? I will point out that, according to newspaper reports, they intended to "collar" deputies in Red Square in order to tell them what they thought. And this is not just a journalist's unfortunate expression.

As is known, the previous rally ended in an attempt to break through to Red Square. There was information that a similar attempt would also be made 28 March. Appeals were being made to surround the Kremlin with a human chain of demonstrators and to prevent the congress participants from leaving if they adopted unwelcome decisions.

We were simply compelled to take measures to ensure the deputies' freedom and to prevent pressure on them. No additional troops were brought into Moscow. Only

subunits of the capital's militia, the internal troop units stationed here, including the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Division, and also students of military academies and individual Moscow garrison units were used. There was no sending in, and so it is ridiculous to speak of a withdrawal of additional troops supposedly now under way. Military hardware was not used, and trucks were merely means of transport.

On the whole, the city has calmed down. There are no complaints from deputies about the maintenance of order. But since we know about new planned demonstrations, we are compelled to maintain the enhanced readiness of the militia and the internal troops stationed in Moscow in order to prevent or eliminate any possible disturbances.

Shevardnadze Rejects 28 Mar Military Presence
LD0104151791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian in the "Before and After Midnight" at 2116 GMT on 30 March carries a 15-minute recorded interview with former Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze by program host Pavel Molchanov on 29 March. The venue is not given. Molchanov first asks Shevardnadze about his family's reaction to his resignation as foreign minister. Shevardnadze says that he took advice from his wife and children in Tbilisi by telephone early in the morning of 20 December, and from his advisers, too, so they were prepared for it. But Shevardnadze says he thinks his resignation was the step of an "honest man".

Molchanov then asks Shevardnadze, in light of the statement in which he said that the events in Tbilisi and Baku might be repeated, if he had prior knowledge of the "Baltic tragedy". Shevardnadze says that this statement was based upon his analysis of the situation in the country.

It's not a bad thing for democratic forces to want power but the main danger comes from extreme right-wing reactionary forces, Shevardnadze says, but he declines to name names. He says that the threat of dictatorship has not lessened and has even become exacerbated with the worsening sociopolitical situation in the country and the threat from the right remains.

Molchanov asks Shevardnadze: "Do you think that Gorbachev, as a politician, has reached his limit?" Shevardnadze says he cannot say Gorbachev has exhausted himself as a politician because "we all made mistakes, not just secondary ones, but in fundamental directions. There were mistakes, major mistakes, and major errors. But there are still opportunities to build a law-governed state. I think our president can still do a lot that is useful."

Shevardnadze says that he is deeply troubled by the events in the Baltics and in Moscow on 28 March, especially by the presence of military hardware in the

capital. "It seems to me that these are very dangerous experiments. I want to make that statement publicly today. That cannot be allowed. We have not seen military hardware on Red Square since the war. Probably, more trust can and must be put in the people, including in the democratic movement. A real, honest, and open dialogue with all parties, with all leaders, including with the leaders of Russia, is needed."

Shevardnadze recalls the efforts undertaken for civilized dialogue between the United States and the USSR and wonders why such a dialogue is not possible between the peoples of the USSR. He thinks it is possible but real efforts must be made to bring it about and all ambitions must be put to one side.

Shevardnadze Reiterates Dictatorship Warning

PM0204103391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Apr 91 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report under "Our People Speak About Us" rubric and general headline: "Opinion for Export"]

[Text] Voice of America has broadcast the following report:

Former USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who resigned unexpectedly last December in protest of what he called the onset of dictatorship, says that this threat persists. Appearing on U.S. television, Shevardnadze noted that such a turn of events in the USSR will be a disaster of unionwide and international significance.

According to Shevardnadze, the concentration of political power in President Gorbachev's hands could have ruinous consequences for the Soviet Union and the whole world. "The onset of dictatorship will be a tragedy," he said. "This could lead to civil war and bloodshed and, I tell you frankly, that the emergence of dictatorship will be a tragedy for other countries too, including the United States."

Law on Cabinet of Ministers Published

91UN1184A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Law of the USSR: "Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR"]

[Text] This law, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, determines the competence of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR, the procedure of its activity, and its relations with other official bodies.

I. The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR in the System of the Highest Organs of State Power and Administration of the USSR

Section 1. General Provisions

Article 1. Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR—executive and administrative body of the USSR

In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is the executive and administrative body of the USSR and is subordinate to the president of the USSR.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is responsible to the president of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR—the USSR Government—is empowered to decide questions of state administration within the jurisdiction of the USSR insofar as they are not, according to the USSR Constitution, within the competence of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Federation Council.

Article 2. Legislation governing the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The competence and procedure of the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and its relations with other official bodies are determined by the USSR Constitution, this law and other legislative instruments of the USSR, and its main assignments, also by edicts of the president of the USSR.

Article 3. Basic principles of the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is guided in its activity by the principles of legality, federalism, collegiality and glasnost.

Article 4. Decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR issues ordinances and regulations binding throughout the territory of the USSR and on all bodies, organizations, officials and citizens.

The ordinances and regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR may be reversed only by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the president of the USSR.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR exercises supervision and verification of compliance with its own decisions directly or via bodies under its jurisdiction.

Section 2. Formation and composition of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Article 5. Formation of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is formed by the president of the USSR with regard for the opinion of the Federation Council and upon concordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet. Changes to the composition of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are made in the same procedure.

Candidates for the office of prime minister are presented by the president of the USSR and confirmed by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Should the USSR Supreme Soviet turn down a candidate presented for the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR, the president of the USSR presents for the USSR Supreme Soviet's consideration a new candidate.

Article 6. Composition of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is formed in the composition of a prime minister and his deputies and ministers of the USSR.

Heads of government of the republics may participate on a voting basis in the business of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Article 7. Program of activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The newly formed Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR submits for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet a program of future activity for its term of office.

The prime minister sets forth the program of the cabinet's impending activity at a joint session of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The timeframe for presentation of the program is determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In the event of the USSR Supreme Soviet rejecting the program of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR, the question of the cabinet's resignation may be raised.

Article 8. Term of office of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR operates within the term of office of the president of the USSR and tenders its resignation to a newly elected president of the USSR.

Section 3. Relations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR with the highest organs of state power and administration of the USSR

Article 9. Responsibility of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR renders account of its work not less than once a year to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to raise the question of account being rendered by an individual member of the cabinet. In the event of an unsatisfactory work evaluation, the question of his fitness for the position he holds may be raised.

The USSR Supreme Soviet may express no confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR, which entails its

resignation. A decree on this matter is adopted by a majority of no less than two-thirds of the total number of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The president of the USSR adopts measures for the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR's exercise of its authority. The unlawful prevention or interference of any official body, public association, official or other person in the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR on questions within its jurisdiction are prohibited.

Article 10. Activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR on the basis and in execution of laws of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR operates on the basis of laws of the USSR and other decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet and enactments of the president of the USSR.

Within its competence the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR organizes execution of the laws of the USSR, other decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet and enactments of the president of the USSR and exercises systematic supervision of their fulfillment by USSR ministries and other bodies within its jurisdiction.

Article 11. Answers to inquiries of USSR people's deputies and standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR or the member of the cabinet to whom at a meeting of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR or a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet the inquiry of a people's deputy of the USSR or group of deputies or of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet is addressed concerning the activity of the cabinet or bodies within its jurisdiction is obliged to give an answer verbally or in writing in the procedure established by law.

Article 12. Examination in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR of recommendations and proposals of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR examines the recommendations and proposals of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet on questions of the cabinet's activity and adopts the necessary measures.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR notifies the pertinent commissions and committees of the results of the examination of the recommendations and proposals within the timeframe they have determined.

Article 13. Right of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR to resign

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR has the right to tender to the president of the USSR its resignation.

The resignation of the prime minister entails resignation of the whole cabinet.

In the event of its resignation, the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR continues to perform its duties until a new cabinet is formed.

Article 14. The question of confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The president of the USSR or the prime minister have the right to raise in the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

A decision on an expression of confidence in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is adopted if more than half the USSR Supreme Soviet votes in favor.

If the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR fails to gain the confidence of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it is required to tender its resignation.

Article 15. Participation of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR in the examination of questions by the highest organs of state power of the USSR

Members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR have the right to attend meetings of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and meetings of standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to be heard.

In the event of USSR people's deputies raising questions concerning the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR or individual members thereof, the prime minister has the right to obtain the necessary explanations on these matters.

The prime minister and members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR provide the necessary information pertaining to questions of their activity at sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and meetings of the standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Section 4. Relations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR with official bodies of the republics

Article 16. The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR may engage in joint activity with the governments of the republics in the sphere of economic and social development and the creation of interrepublic bodies enterprises and organizations.

The republic governments have the right to submit for consideration by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR proposals pertaining to questions of all-Union significance which are subject to compulsory examination in the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

On matters pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Union of SSR decisions affecting the rights of the republics are adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR upon concordance with the governments of the corresponding republics and are binding on them.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR promotes the pooling of the republics' forces and resources on a bilateral and multilateral basis for the implementation of most important all-Union programs and joint projects and the organization of mutual assistance and contributes to the fullest use of rights and possibilities by all republics.

In respect to proposals of the governments of the republics the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR has the right to decide questions of interrepublic significance.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR may upon concordance with the governments of the republics transfer to them decisions on individual questions of state administration within its jurisdiction.

Article 17. Settlement of disagreements between governments of the republics and organs of state administration of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR examines disagreements arising between governments of the republics and ministries of the USSR and other bodies under its jurisdiction.

At the suggestion of the governments of the republics the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR may examine disagreements arising between the governments of the republics.

Article 18. Permanent missions of governments of the republics

For the purpose of supporting the day-to-day relations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR with the governments of the republics permanent missions of the governments of the republics will be attached to the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Article 19. Relations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR with organs of local self-government

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR provides for observance by USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction of the rights of organs of self-government and contributes to the creation of the conditions for the economic and social development of the corresponding territories.

II. Competence of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Article 20. Basic authority of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR provides for:

the pursuit in conjunction with the republics of a single financial, credit and monetary policy based on a

common currency; compilation and execution of the Union budget; implementation of all-Union economic programs; the creation of interrepublic development funds and funds for the elimination of the consequences of natural disasters and catastrophes;

the administration in conjunction with the republics of the single fuel and power and transport systems of the country; administration of defense enterprises, space research and Union communications and information systems, meteorology, geodesy, cartography, geology, meteorology and standardization; pursuit of concerted policy in the sphere of nature conservation, environmental safety and use of the natural environment;

the implementation in conjunction with the republics of all-Union programs of food, health care, social security, employment, care of mother and child, culture and education, basic research and the stimulation of S&T progress;

the adoption of measures to provide for the defense of the country and state security;

realization of the foreign policy of the Union of SSR, regulation of the foreign economic activity of the Union of SSR, coordination of the foreign policy and foreign economic activity of the republics and customs; and

the implementation of measures agreed with the republics pertaining to the assurance of legality and the citizens' rights and liberties, protection of property and public order, and the fight against crime.

On the basis and in execution of laws of the USSR, other decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet and enactments of the president of the USSR the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR:

shapes the basic principles of official S&T policy, formulates and realizes measures pertaining to the development of science and technology, develops international S&T cooperation and draws up and implements S&T and other programs of all-Union significance and all-Union programs of the development of the higher school and the training and certification of research and pedagogical personnel of the highest qualifications;

caters for the functioning and management of a uniform patent system;

caters for the functioning and management of a uniform state system in respect to the use of air space;

organizes the management of facilities of all-Union ownership;

adopts measures for the efficient functioning of the all-Union market;

provides for the creation and use in accordance with the law of the USSR Pension Fund, the Union Extra-Budget Fund for Stabilization of the Economy and other all-state funds;

regulates on an all-Union scale the prices of key types of raw material, food, commodities and services, the list of which is agreed with the republics;

draws up all-state programs pertaining to the environmental safety of the public and the prevention and elimination of the consequences of environmental disasters;

draws up and realizes in conjunction with the republics programs of housing construction and programs for the improvement of work conditions and safety at work; directs the all-Union system of warning and actions in emergency situations;

elaborates common principles for determination of the minimum consumer budget;

pursues the all-Union statistical policy determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet;

organizes the safe production, storage, use and burial of fissionable material;

provides for the construction of most important facilities of all-Union significance;

adopts within its jurisdiction decisions on the signing of intergovernmental international agreements of the USSR and confirms and denounces such agreements; implements measures supporting fulfillment of the international agreements of the USSR;

confers ranks on the top officer corps and special titles corresponding thereto if this is not within the jurisdiction of the president of the USSR;

decides within its jurisdiction other questions of state administration within the province of the Union of SSR.

Article 21. General questions of leadership of USSR ministries and other bodies under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR unites and directs the work of USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction directly or via specially formed commissions.

For the concerted solution of questions of state administration boards are formed in the ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR which incorporate ex officio the leaders of the corresponding organs of the republics.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR forms as necessary main administrations, committees, commissions, state inspectorates and other bodies under the auspices of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and also other organizations and establishments and reorganizes and abolishes them.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR confirms the regulations governing USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction, the numbers of employees of their central staff and the amount of the appropriations from the Union budget for its support within the limits of the sums allocated for this purpose.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR may, if necessary, transfer the solution of individual questions of state administration within its jurisdiction to USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction.

Article 22. Appointment to office and dismissal from office of executives of organs of state administration of the USSR under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR selects the executives of the organs of state administration of the USSR under its jurisdiction.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR appoints to and dismisses from office executives of the organs of state administration which it has formed. In accordance with a submission of ministers of the USSR and other leaders of bodies under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR it appoints to and dismisses from office deputy ministers of the USSR and deputy leaders of other bodies under its jurisdiction and confirms and relieves of their duties members of boards of ministries of the USSR and other bodies under its jurisdiction.

Article 23. The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR's supervision of the activity of the bodies under its jurisdiction

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR exercises constant supervision of the activity of USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction.

USSR ministries and other bodies under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR should make full use of the rights accorded them for the accomplishment of their assigned tasks and their exercise of their functions and for the independent solution of questions within their province.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR has the right to abrogate enactments of USSR ministries and other bodies under its jurisdiction.

Article 24. Questions of the activity of ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR

Ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR exercise leadership of their assigned spheres of activity and are responsible for the accomplishment of the tasks within their competence. In their activity ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR rely, as a rule, on economic methods.

Ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR promulgate within their competence instruments on the basis and in execution of laws of the USSR, other decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet, enactments of the president of the USSR and ordinances and regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and organize and verify their execution.

Ministers and leaders of other central organs of state administration of the USSR are personally responsible for the accomplishment by the pertinent ministries and other organs of state administration of the assignments entrusted to them and their exercise of their own functions.

III. Organization of the Activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Article 25. Meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and the decisionmaking procedure

Meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are held as necessary, but not less than once a quarter. The president of the USSR may preside at meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR examines at its meetings:

- the program of activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR;
- draft concepts and forecasts of the economic and social development of the USSR;
- drafts of the most important all-Union programs;
- the draft Union budget;
- accounts of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR to be presented for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet or the president of the USSR;
- questions concerning an expression of confidence in or the resignation of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR;
- other most important questions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy.

Decisions at meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are adopted by a majority of the persons participating in the vote.

Article 26. Presidium of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

A Presidium of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR composed of the prime minister and his deputies and the administrator of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR—a minister of the USSR—operates to ensure the day-to-day leadership of the economy and the solution of other questions of state administration.

The Presidium of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR does not have the right to adopt decisions on questions within the jurisdiction, in accordance with Article 25 of this law, of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Article 27. Prime minister of the USSR

The prime minister is head of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and directs its activity.

The prime minister:

- organizes the work of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and its Presidium and directs their meetings;
- allocates duties among the deputy prime ministers;
- ensures collegiality in the work of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR;
- represents the USSR in international relations in accordance with the USSR Constitution and laws of the USSR;
- adopts decisions on questions of state administration not requiring examination at a meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR;

encourages ministers of the USSR and other officials of bodies under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and imposes disciplinary penalties on them.

In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the prime minister also has other powers specified by this law and other laws of the USSR.

Article 28. Deputy prime ministers of the USSR

Deputy prime ministers undertake in accordance with the allocation of duties coordination of the activity of ministries and other bodies under the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and supervision of their work and give them instructions promptly in support of the fulfillment of ordinances and regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and in respect to other questions of their activity and preliminarily examine proposals and draft ordinances and regulations to be submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

In the event of the prime minister being absent, his duties are performed by the first deputy prime minister.

Article 29. Members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR:

- are responsible for the spheres of activity assigned them and for the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR as a whole;

- participate in the examination of questions at meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and its Presidium;

- may submit to the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR proposals concerning the examination of questions within the jurisdiction of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and present an initiative pertaining to the elaboration of decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR;

- have the right to resign;

- do not have the right to hold other positions at enterprises and organizations, except for participation in the activity of public associations, and also to engage in entrepreneurial activity.

The conditions of the remuneration and material-social support of members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are determined by the president of the USSR and approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 30. Assurance of glasnost and the consideration of public opinion in the activity of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Representatives of the mass media may participate in meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and its bodies in the procedure they establish.

Draft ordinances of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR on most important issues may be put to public discussion.

For the purpose of the ascertainment of public opinion when preparing drafts and realizing decisions on most important issues the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR organizes sociological surveys.

The decisions on the most important issues adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR or its bodies are announced in the press and on television and radio.

Article 31. Ordinances and regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

Decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR of a prescriptive nature or national economic significance or of general significance are issued in the form of ordinances.

Decisions pertaining to operational and other current issues of a nonprescriptive nature are issued in the form of regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Ordinances of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR or its Presidium, and regulations, by the prime minister or his first deputies.

Ordinances of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are signed by the prime minister of the USSR and the administrator of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are signed by the prime minister of the USSR or his first deputies.

Ordinances and regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR take effect the moment they are adopted unless otherwise stipulated in these enactments.

Ordinances of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are published, as a rule, in the Collection of Government Ordinances and, if their extensive and immediate promulgation is necessary, are brought to general attention by the mass media.

On matters within their province the deputy prime ministers adopt decisions in the form of deputy prime minister instructions.

Article 32. Staff of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR

For the preparation of analytical, information and other material, formulation of the corresponding proposals and the systematic verification of the fulfillment of decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR a Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR staff functions.

The staff of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR is headed by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR administrator—a minister of the USSR.

The leaders of the main subdivisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and their deputies are appointed to office and dismissed from office by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

Employees of the staff of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR should possess high professional and moral qualities and are required to execute the laws of the USSR and express and defend the interests of the people and the state and serve them.

The rights, duties and responsibility of the employees of the staff of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR are determined in accordance with regulations confirmed by the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

The structure, size, and remuneration and material-social support conditions of the staff of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR and expenditure on its support are determined by the prime minister within the limits of the appropriations from the Union budget for support of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The Kremlin, Moscow, 20 March 1991

Decree Enacting Law

91UN1184B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet "Implementation of the USSR Law 'The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To implement the USSR law "The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR" as of its enactment.

2. That prior to the concordance of legislation of the Union of SSR and the republics with the USSR law "The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR," current instruments of legislation of the Union of SSR and the republics will apply to the extent that they do not contradict this law.

3. That the president of the USSR will submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals concerning the conditions of the remuneration and material-social support of members of the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR.

4. That the Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR will within a period of three months:

present to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals concerning the concordance of legislative instruments of the USSR with the USSR law "The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR";

bring decisions of the USSR Government into concordance with the USSR law "The Cabinet of Ministers of the USSR";

ensure the revision and cancellation by ministries and other central organs of state administration of the USSR of their legislative instruments, including sets of instructions, conflicting with this law.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

The Kremlin, Moscow, 20 March 1991

Economic**Orders To Cut Illegal Goods Turnover Issued**

CM0204111191 Moscow PRAVDA Russian
2 April 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Package of Urgent Measures"]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Apr—USSR Procurator General Nikolay Trubin, USSR Internal Affairs Minister Boris Pugo, and KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov have issued joint instructions on cutting the illegal turnover of consumer goods and raw materials.

The leaders of the central law enforcement bodies, taking into account the acuteness and urgency of the situation which has developed, have ordered procurators, internal affairs ministers, and chairmen of the state security committees of the Union republics to implement without delay the additional joint specific measures to cut off channels and loss of output into illegal turnover. Proceeding from the USSR President's letter, dated 31 March 1991, to the leaders of supreme soviets and the governments of the republics, the main attention is concentrated on the places of production, transportation, storage, and marketing of goods intended for sale at state retail and regulated prices and goods arriving from abroad and on monitoring so that the discipline of prices is met.

The efforts of the law enforcement bodies are concentrated on: cutting short the activity of criminal groups engaged in concluding deals involving goods for which fixed and regulated prices have been set and involving raw materials and their transfer into the commercial, cooperative and individual sectors and abroad; and the actions by private individuals and officials aimed at creating artificial shortage of goods needed by the population with a subsequent increase in the high prices for them.

PRAVDA Cites Gorbachev Message on Prices

PM0204102791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1

["TASS commentary" on message by President Gorbachev to republic leaders on prices]

[Text] The USSR president's letter to the leaders of republic supreme soviets and governments deals with a very important issue for the population.

As is well known, so-called "contract" prices on basic foodstuffs and many nonfood items have emerged and have been widely applied. The cause of this phenomenon lies in misconstruing the transition to the market as meaning total license in the sphere of price formation. Local organs of authority have played an extremely negative role here.

Unfortunately, the example for such unlawful practice was set by the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee

[gorispolkom]. Last August it granted trade enterprises the right to purchase goods for the population and sell them in the state trade network at inflated contract prices.

Replacing the daily, painstaking work of organizing supplies to the population by buying up goods from neighbors at inflated prices could not and has not led to an improvement in supply. The population has had to pay for this. Prices of meat, fish, eggs, and also many other basic foodstuffs jumped sharply, and the cost of eating in canteens went up.

The application of contract prices to basic consumer goods runs counter to the principles of pricing policy agreed with the republics. The agreement between the USSR and the republics stipulates that the fixed state retail prices are retained on them. The ceilings for all groups of goods have been determined and prices may not be set above them.

The USSR Supreme Soviet in its resolution requires the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to step up monitoring to ensure observance of state price discipline and to confiscate from enterprises, organizations, and local organs any extra revenue obtained from the sale of goods at prices exceeding the agreed ceilings.

Price-forming organs, which have received the legal foundation for resolute action, should instill order in retail prices and protect citizens' interests. However, they will scarcely solve the task without the support of the population itself. For this the population needs to know its rights. Every store and every point of trade should display a list of goods sold at fixed retail prices. Local organs of power and consumer societies should concern themselves with this in order to end prices anarchy by their joint efforts and start moving toward a civilized market.

Senchagov on Price Reform, Gorbachev Letter

LD3103191191 Moscow Central Television Vostok
Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT
31 Mar 91

[Interview with Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, by unidentified correspondent; from the "Vremya" news-cast—live]

[Text] [Correspondent] Good day, comrades! I would like to introduce a guest on our program, Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices. We have invited Vyacheslav Konstantinovich to visit our studio in connection with the fact that the USSR president sent a letter today to the presidents and chairmen of the Union and autonomous republics. This letter says: I draw your attention to the fact that in a number of the country's regions contractual prices are used for some goods, and their level is higher than that of state retail prices which are envisaged for these goods by an agreement between the Union Soviet

Socialist Republics and the republics with regard to the reform of retail prices and social protection of the population. I request that in the interests of consumers new prices be established for indicated goods in step with provisions of the agreement on maximum increases of the state retail prices. So, this was the letter which the USSR president sent to the localities. Your comment, please.

[Senchagov] I think that this is a very important step by the president, aimed at strengthening the discipline of prices, because I think, that the market is sometimes understood as prices free-for-all. This process has begun, unfortunately. We can see that the same item has different prices in the same shop. This all is explained sometimes, you know, by some kind of noble interests, for consumers' sake, for social protection, and so on.

[Correspondent] By the way, to what extent has this phenomenon spread in our country? Whom does this letter concern, first and foremost?

[Senchagov] Unfortunately, it has spread to a quite significant extent. Industrial towns, in particular, like Moscow and Leningrad. But this process has begun in the countryside as well. It is important that the president firmly confirms his resoluteness to fight this phenomenon.

[Correspondent] Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, we can also fight by probably applying some kind of sanctions on infringers. First and foremost, by this method. Have such sanctions been envisaged at present, and how serious will they be?

[Senchagov] I would say that economic sanctions are being envisaged, by all means. The essence of these sanctions comes to the difference in prices. For example, if an egg is on sale in a shop at a higher price than that envisaged by the interrepublican agreement, then the difference between the higher contractual price and the state price, the maximum price, is being transferred into a republican budget or into the Union budget. The procedure can be somewhat different here depending on commodity groups. It is important that society benefits from the transfer of this income, and that none of those who are raising prices benefit from it.

[Correspondent] Well, in order to be able to establish this very difference, let us say, it is necessary, probably, to control prices. Do we have capable bodies to carry out the control of prices?

[Senchagov] There are such bodies, but their capability is very small. At present, the president is taking important steps in this direction, as well as the Supreme Soviet. An inspection, state inspection, is being set up to control prices. There is a directorate on price control, but its powers are weak. A controller, at times, is unable to apply sanctions. Sometimes he is threatened with physical violence. His interests, his role as the defender of the interests of the state, is not recognized.

[Correspondent] ...of the consumer, first and foremost.

[Senchagov] Yes, and also of the consumer, that is true. It is not recognized. So, this is the point. At present, status for the controller is required so he can stop the infringer at the right time.

[Correspondent] You said it is required. But when will it be available?

[Senchagov] Well, you see, we are not sitting and doing nothing, we are working and seeking to strengthen this control. I think that a mass check-up is to be carried out at present on how the economic agreement, and specifically, the agreement on prices, is being observed. All contractual prices, which are above the maximum level, are to be abolished en masse.

[Correspondent] We hope that it will happen exactly this way. Thank you for the interview.

March Inflation Rate up 3.5 Percent

LD0104183791 Moscow World Service in English
1600 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Last month's inflation rates in the Soviet Union, as compared to February, were up by 3.5 percent and by 6.2 percent in large cities. The figure is said to be much higher for the Moscow district. With swiftly raising incomes, there is an acute shortage of consumer goods. Tomorrow's price increases, designed to stabilize the country's social and economic situation, are accompanied by compensation to offset the fall in living standards.

Psychological Barriers to Market Economy Persist

PM0204110991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Yu. Rytov commentary under "Statistics and Our Commentary" rubric: "Road to Market Economy; No Way Back"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics has conducted a poll of more than 10,000 citizens in all regions of the country with the aim of establishing people's attitude toward the new forms of economic management and ownership.

As was to be expected, no one likes the present economic situation and everyone appreciates the need for radical change. A substantial proportion of respondents (45 percent) are even prepared to accept temporary material hardship on the condition that life improves significantly in the future. People realize that they will have to come up against a number of negative phenomena on the way to a market economy.

Now let us ask a question regarding which our statistics are still powerless: To what extent are negative phenomena inherent in market relations? At the moment, we are only on the distant approaches to a market

economy. I will nevertheless venture the supposition that the root of our misfortune lies in the absence of such an economy. Having finally said "a" after agonizing hesitation, we cannot bring ourselves to say "b," and we are still trying to harness a stallion (the administrative system) and a timid deer (the market system) to the same cart.

Clearly, under no circumstances must we idealize market relations either, as they too are associated with economic costs and moral losses. Nevertheless, world experience proves that the pluses outweigh the minuses. Market relations ensure a high level of production efficiency, which, if not the basis of social justice, is at least the basis of social protection.

However, it is only possible to objectively judge a phenomenon if it actually exists. How can you form an opinion on something that is not there? Evidently it is no coincidence that the statistical survey showed that there are still not very many people in our country who would like to start their own business and run it at their own risk: a mere 14.9 percent of respondents. The wishes of the majority are far more modest: to have a steady wage, even if it is not very much, and confidence in the future (56.4 percent).

I must repeat, however, that people are perfectly well aware that there is no alternative to a market economy and that change cannot be avoided. Consequently, development of new forms of economic management received their full support. For example, 65 percent of respondents spoke out in favor of individual labor activity; 62 percent in favor of leasehold forms of economic management; and 59 percent in favor of private farmsteads [fermerskiye khozyaystva].

So, how do people feel about private ownership? Some 30 percent of respondents were in favor of private enterprises (the same number were in favor of cooperatives, incidentally). As we can see, their attitude is rather cautious. Almost half (44 percent) objected to the sale of state enterprises to private individuals. And more than half (51 percent) were opposed to the resulting hire of manpower by private owners. Well, it is hard to shake off old ideological dogma.

The attitude toward private ownership of land is somewhat different. As many as 54 percent were in favor. Some 47 percent said that they would like to buy land themselves. True, one in five said that they would not be able to.

What about property ownership? Seven percent of respondents expressed the desire to acquire premises in order to rent out accommodation; 6 percent would like to buy a store, cafe, or restaurant; and 3 percent would like to have a consumer services enterprise. Here are the statistics for other sections: 14 percent spoke out in favor of plants and factories being handed over to labor collectives free of charge; 9 percent were in favor of a leasehold system; 5 percent would like to see enterprises

set up with the help of foreign capital; and less than 4 percent would like enterprises to be transformed into cooperatives.

The opinion poll shows that psychological as well as organizational barriers stand in the way of a market economy.

Pavlov Begins Hearing Miners' Grievances

*LD0204101791 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT
2 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—Soviet Government officials began a meeting with representatives of more than 50 miners' associations in the Kremlin's Sverdlov Hall today to discuss the situation in the industry and ways to resolve the crisis.

The meeting was opened by Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. After a long debate on the agenda and procedural questions, miners began making statements.

The meeting is expected to last two or three days.

11 Vorkuta Mines on Strike; Losses Mount

*LD0104210591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Apr 91*

[Text] The Severnaya mine collective today joined the striking miners of polar Vorkuta, a TASS correspondent reports. Eleven of thirteen mines are now participating in the strike in various ways. Six are completely idle. According to preliminary figures, losses at the Vorkuta coal association from the strike amount to more than R70 million. Yun-Yaga and Vorkutinskaya mines have stopped shipments to the Cherepovets metallurgical combine.

All five mines of the Intaogol concern are also continuing their strikes. In March, their extraction shortfall was more than 170,000 tonnes of fuel, and their deliveries to consumers are short more than 100,000 tonnes.

Further Details on Coal Strike Situation

*LD0104215491 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT
1 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The situation in coal basins remained tense today, on the eve of a meeting between miners and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. New mines joined the strike in some places.

Representatives of all coal-mining amalgamations in the Donetsk region, south-eastern Ukraine, will participate in the talks with the Soviet Government. Miners' delegates departed for Moscow today.

Mine dispatchers report that 20 collieries out of 122 operating in the region are hit by the strike. All in all, 47 mining enterprises are at a standstill in the Ukraine.

According to reports from Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic, the Severnaya mine also joined striking miners in Vorkuta today. Eleven out of 13 Vorkuta mines participate in the strike in various forms. Six are fully idle.

According to preliminary data, losses of the Vorkutaugol amalgamation amounted to 412,000 tonnes of coal in March and over 300,000 tonnes were not shipped to consumers. The amalgamation's total losses topped 70 million roubles.

The Yun-Yaga and Vorkutinskaya mines today stopped shipping coal to the Cherepovets Iron and Steel Combine.

All the five mines of the Intaugol concern, which lost over 170,000 tonnes of coal, continue the strike in the city of Inta. A rally of coal miners was held in Inta on Sunday.

Its participants confirmed economic and political demands put forth by miners, including the main ones: nationwide elections of the Soviet president in 1991 and early elections of the all-Union parliament.

TASS reports from the Sverdlovsk region that four out of five mines of the Severouralsk bauxite deposit stopped the recovery of bauxites: a day-long warning strike began there this morning.

The strike committee demands that the management immediately adopt a programme for social protection of workers, cut managerial personnel and remove the Communist Party committee from the production grounds.

Strikers also demanded that the Russian Congress of People's Deputies put the question of the executive presidency on the agenda of its current session.

Pit Strikes Hit Railroad Workers, Steelmen

*PM0204105191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 6*

[Report by Yu. Medvedev: "We Are Losing Tonnes and Rubles; Repercussions of Miners' Strikes"]

[Text] The voices of those who are feeling the effects of the miners' strikes are becoming ever louder. The railroad workers have been badly affected.

The Ministry of Railways is under great pressure as it implements coal delivery plans. For instance, in the last two months a number of USSR Coal Industry Ministry enterprises were responsible for the loss of nearly 62,000 carloads of coal, or more than 4 million tonnes.

The biggest losses were in the Donbass—1.5 million tonnes—and the Kuzbass—0.8 million tonnes of coal. Because of the suspension of work at a number of mines, supplies of coking coal to steelworkers have been extremely poor since the beginning of March. Reserves are well down. All this has had a deleterious effect not

only on the production of ferrous and nonferrous metals but also that of chemical products, and also sugar and other foodstuffs.

During the 25 days of March since the start of the strikes steelworkers have failed to receive 1.6 million tonnes of coking coal. Fuel stocks at heat and power stations are 2.6 million tonnes down on last year. Supplies to municipal and consumer enterprises and the population of cities and villages are 1.2 million tonnes adrift.

The reduction in shipments has adversely affected railroad economic indicators. In January-February coal freight car idle time in enterprise sidings increased by 0.74 hours, and by 0.81 hours compared with last year.

Labor collectives are sustaining financial losses because of the reduction in the volume of coal being offered for shipment and the sidelining of a large quantity of rolling stock. For example, every 24 hours on the Kemerovo Railroad over 7,000 empty gondola cars are either unutilized or are standing idle waiting for freight. It is no laughing matter when in March alone Kuzbass miners turned away approximately 10,000 freight cars which were intended to ship more than 650,000 tonnes of coal. The situation is difficult on the Donetsk, northern, and a number of other railroads. This is on top of the acute shortage of rolling stock in many regions.

Since the beginning of the year the railroad workers have lost 16.6 million rubles as a result of nonfulfillment of the freight shipment plan. It is this money that pays the wages and forms the social security funds. Both tonnes and rubles are being lost.

Transportation workers in many regions are worried about the exacerbation of the situation because of the strikes. "You have suspended coal shipments," Lvov railroad workers say to the miners. "There are hundreds of empty freight cars standing in the sidings. We appreciate your problems, because they have been given a good deal of attention. We expect to see an improvement in living conditions and in the technical standard of transport facilities. But we believe that stopping work is not the way to solve these and other vital problems."

Power Struggle Seen Behind Kuzbass Strikes

*PM0104160091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Second Edition pp 1, 3*

[Vladimir Loktev article under the rubric "Kuzbass: Turbulent March": "Strike: Who Is Riding to Power on the Backs of the Miners"]

[Text] The other day I returned from a trip to the Kuzbass. I had been there before—last year, and in July-August 1989, when the mining cities and settlements were seething with unprecedented passions among working people at the end of their tethers. At that time, the miners' wrath and indignation prompted an unequivocal, firm reaction in my mind—the miners' economic demands were justified, and the strike was an

extreme but necessary measure by desperate people. But it was then, in the summer of 1989, that the political forces emerged that were subsequently to try repeatedly to exploit the unresolved problems of the Kuzbass miners for their own ends. Therefore I was not surprised to learn that the latest wave of strikes in the region had taken on a political color.

As the sixth year of perestroika draws to a close, we have well and truly lost the optimism of spring 1985. And the reasons are very substantial. Today, the prime task of all state structures—Union and republican—is to stop the country's disintegration, prevent our economy from sinking into a terminal decline, and avoid new, devastating upheavals in society. This can only be achieved in conditions of political stability, observance of the rule of law, and civil accord. Otherwise we will have to start many things from scratch, and the people will have to extricate themselves from the consequences of insatiable political ambitions, the "war of sovereignties," and the confrontation between social groupings.

Whereas in 1989 the miners' strikes resulted in losses amounting to tens of billions of rubles, the cost of the present strike will be measured not only in rubles, but also in the number of halted blast furnaces, open-hearth furnaces, byproduct coke industry batteries, thermal power stations...

In human terms, you can understand the miners. In the last 18 months nothing has changed for the better in their lives. But is that in itself enough to explain the transformation of their purely economic demands into tough ultimatums, up to and including the resignation of the country's president? There is food for thought here. Today it is clear to any reasonably intelligent person that the miners' problems cannot be resolved solely by deliveries of goods from abroad, credits, and other humanitarian aid. Especially in the conditions of a continuing decline in the volume of production and labor productivity and the weakening of economic ties and discipline. What can you expect, if we have started to work less well?

"But who is to blame?"—people will ask. And the instigators of the political strike will promptly give a very simple answer: "The center, Gorbachev, Pavlov, the Communist Party, and the rest of them." The range of "arguments" is familiar, and has become routine in recent times. And this premise is apparently rendered particularly convincing by the personal position of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman B.N. Yeltsin on this score. He and his supporters in the struggle against the Union authorities and the CPSU speak about it openly.

There is no denying that the belief in a benevolent tsar is still tenacious among us. Let's get Gorbachev to resign, they say, then Yeltsin will come, and we'll start to live how people should. But what will the Kuzbass miners say if, for instance, tomorrow the metalworkers demand the resignation of their benefactor, and the next day the

oilmen bring down the next president? How will we build the rule-of-law state that the "democrats" so eagerly call for? That is the way to turn the country into a madhouse.

Let me stress again: The problems of the Kuzbass are exceptionally acute and the center is partly to blame for it, but after all, the Russian leadership is in no great hurry to help the miners, apart from alluring promises and complaints about the lack of true republic sovereignty. Well, what did Boris Nikolayevich do when he was chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction Affairs to resolve the very acute housing problem in the Kuzbass? But now that he wants your muscle in the open struggle for power, he is generous with his advances. He calls on you: Come over to Russia's jurisdiction, and we will resolve all the questions at once. Oh yeah? How are you going to resolve them? Because after this strike, the already burdensome coal sector will become a stone around the neck of a drowning man. And it will no longer be possible to shift the blame to the center. And where is the certainty that in a year's time you won't be laying into him too, as you are laying into the president today? But that is only a personal assumption, a possible "boomerang effect," so to speak...

In the past week I have talked with intelligent, reasonable people who are well known in Kemerovo, Vasily Fedorov, Aleksandr Muzhevitin, and Yuriy Yevtyukhin. They have their own plan, and I think it is an interesting one, for overcoming the Kuzbass crisis. But that is another story, to be covered in a later issue. I must agree with their complaints against the Union and Russian leadership: It is necessary, they say, finally to study in depth the roots of our troubles, and to adopt concrete measures to eliminate them, instead of sending in the "fire brigade" to "extinguish" yet another strike.

I would like to consider in the light of this advice the purpose of the one-day visit to the Kuzbass by I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The miners' strike had reached a critical point. And everyone, from the oblast leaders to the ordinary miner, was waiting to see what Russia's prime minister would have to say about it. Ivan Stepanovich traveled to Mezhdurechensk to the "Raspadskaya" pit, and visited the silk textiles combine in Kemerovo. In an hour-long report at a meeting with the oblast aktiv he expounded in detail the Russian Government's new program for the transition to the market, stressing that it is based on the well-known "500 Days" draft. About the socioeconomic situation in the region, about his own attitude toward the strike—not a word. And only in answer to a direct question from the auditorium did he say: He was struck by the scale of the strike, and the Russian Government would not wish to embark on the implementation of the program in the conditions of a severely undermined economy. You will agree that even that answer amounts to taking a stance.

I went to Kiselevsk especially to meet with USSR People's Deputy T.G. Avaliani. In the memorable year 1989

he was at the helm of the oblast strike committee. Who could be better placed than he to know the miners' problems from the inside. Kiselevsk, a city of 130,000 inhabitants, is a typical mining city with problems typical of the Kuzbass. Ten mines surrounded by settlements that intermingle with slag heaps to form a single chaotic mass making up this inconvenient, dirty city. Given today's pace of construction, it will take nearly 40 years to resolve the housing problem. You will understand that against the background of this figure civilized life here is losing its original meaning.

"This strike is not like the one in summer 1989," Teymuraz Georgiyevich says. "Then there was order, discipline, reasonable objectives: improvements in housing conditions, supplies, and so forth. But today the strikers gather at the mine, sit there for the specified time, and go their separate ways. And some people don't turn up at the mine at all. These are not strikers, they are ordinary absentees, and also, they are saying: We don't want a sausage revolution, we are fighting for power. Before, the so-called democrats and all kinds of political rogues were driven off the rostrums. Now, they listen to them, and those who are opposed to political demands get the 'slow handclap.' That's pluralism for you. One-sided and rabid."

[Loktev] "But why did you, a popular man in the oblast, leave the post of strike committee chairman and agree to take what is frankly a difficult and thankless post, that of CPSU gorkom [city committee] secretary?"

[Avaliani] "I am used to proving I'm right by means of arguments, not slogans. And I don't want to tilt at windmills. Today the strike movement has been taken over by forces that are trying by every possible means to sling mud at honest communists. I can't go along with them."

[Loktev] "What can you say about your former comrades in arms, the members of the workers' committee?"

[Avaliani] "Many of them have become deputies at various levels. Some of them are clever and some of them less so, some of them are disinterested and some of them are self-interested. All kinds of people float to the surface on the wave of social upheavals. Sometimes just for a moment: They kindle, and die. I think there are many 'stars' of that kind among the leaders of the workers' movement. When it comes to constructive matters they are rather weak, I think, but when it comes to talking they are experts."

[Loktev] "Why did the miners embark on the path of a political strike, in the end?"

[Avaliani] "I don't think it came about without help from outside. Travkin was here, and Kalugin. They hold rallies, they call for the president's removal, for division into national compartments. Our local 'democrats' help them. People have started traveling abroad, they tell you that life over there is paradise. And then an idea worms

its way into people's minds: If industry is handed over to private capital, tomorrow we will have prosperity."

It must be said that in the Kuzbass the workers' committees have become a more or less legitimized (but by whom?—V.L.) alternative power structure. Thus on 14 March an emergency session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies discussed the current situation. The majority of deputies came out against the strike. But some people from the workers' committees and Russian parliamentary deputies, for instance V. Golikov and B. Denisenko, are traveling around the mines and openly calling for the strike to continue "all the way."

Here is an incident I witnessed. A session of the oblast soviet presidium and executive committee was taking place, on the results of the Kuzbass delegation's visit to Moscow. The delegation leader, A. Tuleyev, chairman of the oblast soviet, spoke about the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev and the accords that were reached.

In the course of heated disputes, a constructive approach to the resolution of priority tasks emerged. However, as has happened more than once, the workers' committee representatives tried to deflect the discussion from its businesslike tone into a purely political vein. Tuleyev was bombarded with provocative questions and accusations of connivance with the top Union authorities and party functionaries, betrayal of the miners' interests, and so forth. V. Golikov was particularly angry. He got really carried away and banged the table, and when they tried to call him to order, he ostentatiously left the room. No one was surprised: People here are used to such capers by the RSFSR people's deputy. Of course, he is a reputable man now, he has become an adviser to B.N. Yeltsin on questions of the workers' movement, and has apparently picked up some aspects of his boss' behavior. I suppose V. Golikov could not restrain his furious emotions in the heat of his rage. He can also be forgiven a marked freedom in his dress, but all the same, it would be desirable not to let your superdemocratism go any lower than three unfastened buttons on your shirt. Hardly the thing for a people's deputy.

Russian People's Deputy B. Denisenko has done truly titanic work, there is no other word for it, in organizing the strike and popularizing B.N. Yeltsin in the Kuzbass. At one time Bella Anatolyevna, a doctor of medical sciences, was a diligent communist, and even belonged to the party bureau at the Novokuznetsk Institute of Further Training for Doctors, where she ran a faculty. But on becoming a deputy she got rid of her party card, secured the post of RSFSR deputy minister of health, and became actively involved in the work of the "Democratic Russia" movement. So actively that she has hardly any time left for her real job. Medicine will wait, she says, politics is more important now. The indignant voters of the city's Tsentralnyy Rayon formed an organizing committee to recall Deputy B. Denisenko. Some 5,000 of the inhabitants of Novokuznetsk have already expressed a lack of confidence in her. Speaking at a conference of the West Siberian Metallurgical Combine

labor collective recently, she explained B.N. Yeltsin's position on the strike thus: "...Dear comrades (comrades, observe, not gentlemen—she takes note of the composition of her audience—V.L.), things must be expressed more accurately. Because people are saying that B. Yeltsin sanctioned the strike. The proposal for a strike was adopted at a plenum of the 'Democratic Russia' movement and supported by the body of RSFSR deputies, and when Boris Nikolayevich was informed of this and came to a meeting with the deputies who voted for the proposal, what he said, word for word, was this: 'I support the aims and tasks of the strike and I believe that the labor collectives and workers should, that is, have every right to express their view.' That is, in precisely this way, he supported the strike itself" (from the conference transcript—V.L.).

That seems extremely clear. Is any comment needed? The Russian "democrats" work in the same vein with the miners and metallurgists. Their aim is obvious: to take advantage of the genuinely difficult position of the Kuzbass working people in order to scale the heights of power and win fame as "true fighters for the working people's happiness." Much has already been written about the bitter fruits of this concern. I will add only this detail: Apart from striking a blow against the country's entire economy, the Kuzbass strike has already sparked "echoes" in the empty budget in Kemerovo Oblast, the greater part of which comes from contributions from the region's coal mines and opencuts. The miners are striking, but there will be no money to pay the wages of teachers, medics, office workers... Maybe the Russian leadership will pay them? A. Tuleyev, worn down with the concerns of supporting life in the Kuzbass, sends telegrams to B.N. Yeltsin in despair. No reply. The latest disaster warning was issued this week. It says, in part: "The situation in the Kuzbass remains very difficult. The strike continues at 46 enterprises. The strikers' demands are political. You know what they are. Things have gone a long way. More than 20 blast furnaces have already been stopped, and major metallurgical and byproduct coke industry plants are on the brink of stoppage. From there, the chain extends to the paralysis of the entire economy."

"I have received hundreds of telegrams. Children are freezing in the kindergartens and patients in the hospitals. It is distressing to read them."

"Many oblasts, first and foremost in Russia, are refusing to supply the Kuzbass with food, even on the basis of allocations. The destructive processes that began in the Kuzbass are beginning to come back to us, in the form of a real threat."

"Our miners' despair is understandable. I support them. Things cannot go on like this. And I have always tried to emphasize this, and did so at government level during my recent meeting with the country's president. We are doing everything possible for our part."

"Today's crisis situation requires your urgent intervention, since the Kuzbass strike is hitting the Russian economy hardest. In this connection I cannot understand the logic of your actions. After all, if you are elected president of the republic you will have to begin not even from zero, but from below zero. Neither you nor anyone else will be able to remedy the consequences in a short space of time. Naturally, that will hit our people's vital interests again. It is not hard to predict their reaction. People will demand a speedy resignation. Yours, this time."

The oblast soviet chairman proposes a way out of the situation. In his message to B.N. Yeltsin he advises: "Once again I ask you to appeal personally to the strikers. Thank them for their support, and ask them to resume the extraction and dispatch of coal. That will help the country, and it will help you too"...

Can Boris Nikolayevich really keep quiet this time? After all, it is a desperate request, tearful, begging. And after all, it is a question of the country's fate, Russia's fate.

Semipalatinsk Test Site Conversion Authorized

*LD2703190491 Moscow World Service in English
1600 GMT 27 Mar 91*

[Text] The municipal council of the city of Kurchatov in Kazakhstan has authorized a program for the conversion of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site.

A Radio Moscow observer recalls that earlier the republican supreme soviet banned nuclear tests at the test site. A nuclear power station having advanced safety systems is going to be built in the area. There are plans for opening a center for fundamental and applied physics and Kazakhstan's first physical engineering university.

However, the military, who control the test site, have opposed the plan even though they will be entitled to social protection and employment in civilian industries.

Karpov Cited on Conversion Process

*LD2803060891 Moscow World Service in English
2300 GMT 27 Mar 91*

[Text] Conversion of part of a vast military/industrial complex to civilian use is one of the major economic problems in this country. Soviet citizens have so far seen no tangible results of conversion. Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov explains in the Soviet journal *BUSINESSMAN*. The process of conversion in the USSR is aggravated by many factors. One of these is that up till now it has not been clear to what extent the economy has been militarized. This country has long criticized the U.S. military/industrial complex which amounts to 20 percent and more of the American economy. But there have been no official statistics on this score in the USSR. However, in Karpov's views, defense industry in the USSR may account for two times more than in the United States.

Viktor Karpov believes it's now impossible to foresee the results of disarmament in terms of profitability. Economic militarization by plan and command has led to the distortion of prices, expenditures, and production efficiency. And the prices of Soviet military hardware have been classified as well as its production costs. Nonetheless, most analysts in the USSR believe that conversion is feasible. But its implementation requires not only the government's political will and participation in its organization, it's also necessary to take the munitions plans subject to conversion out of state control and involve them in market relations.

Viktor Karpov feels conversion will be highly lucrative since hi-tech facilities and a skilled workforce will be applied for civilian production. In Karpov's view conversion in the USSR has in fact a wider scope as compared with the United States. It's common knowledge that in the Soviet Union there is a dire shortage of consumer goods whereas in the United States the commodities market is full. The USSR, just as the United States, will have to retrain the discharged labor force and provide social safeguards. Viktor Karpov says peace dividends depends on how quickly and successfully the problems will be solved.

Munitions Plant Switches to Medical Research

LD2803114991 Moscow World Service in English
0800 GMT 28 Mar 91

[Text] One of the munitions enterprises that have begun to convert their production to civilian use is a major engineering plant in Leningrad, which earlier specialized in the manufacture of instruments for the Navy. Plant engineers, jointly with medical specialists, have designed a series of medical instruments, including a compact biostimulator for restoring the muscles of sedentary people. More than 400 Soviet munitions factories have converted part of their facilities to civilian production.

Agriculture

Spring Sowing Campaign Facing Seed Shortage

PM0204112191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[K. Lysenko commentary under "Time To Save the Harvest" rubric and general headline: "Again They Didn't Expect..."]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Let us state frankly that the situation ahead of the sowing campaign in the country as a whole does not inspire great optimism. The volume of spring field work is expected to be 25 percent higher than usual. For more than 20 million hectares have remained unplowed since the fall. Approximately 8 million hectares of winter crops will have to be resown.

Are the peasants ready for such overloads? Far from everywhere. A report from Belgorod Oblast: There is a shortage of fuel. The old story. What is the matter? It is

not difficult to guess. Oil refineries have so far concluded contracts with the "Rosnefteprodukt" state concern, which supplies Russia with fuel, in far smaller volumes than last year. Producers of petroleum products find it more profitable to conduct an exchange in kind than to preserve the former economic ties. As a result, consumers situated on the territory of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic have not been guaranteed deliveries of approximately 5 million tonnes of motor gasoline and 6 million tonnes of diesel fuel.

Information from Uzbekistan: On the eve of the sowing campaign there is a shortage of high-quality corn seeds in the republic. The reason is the same—disruption of the former good-neighborly economic ties. Uzbek landowners are now knocking fruitlessly on Kyrgyz and Ukrainian doors—no one can help. The situation with regard to seeds of spring grain crops is complex. Although there are enough in the country as a whole, Russia is several hundred thousand tonnes short. Tajikistan still does not have 17 percent of the necessary quantity of seeds, and Kyrgyzstan—16 percent.

To all appearances, we are faced with reaping the fruits of the collapse of the former economic ties instead of a considerable part of the harvest. [passage omitted]

Weather, State of Crops in Early March Reported

PM1803111591 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 15 Mar 91 p 2

[Report by agrometeorologist S. Malikova: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] In the northern half of the USSR's European territory the weather was mainly warmer than usual, with air temperatures 1-3 degrees higher than the long-term average over the past 10 days. In the southern half temperatures were 1-4 degrees below the long-term average. The greatest quantity of precipitation (11-30mm and over) fell over a large part of the North Caucasus area, in the Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], in Zaporozhye and Donetsk Oblasts, and in places in Volgograd Oblast and Moldova.

The winter grain crops were dormant. Their wintering conditions were satisfactory. There was no snow cover on winter grain crop fields in the west of the Baltic republics and Belorussia, in the western and southern oblasts of the Ukraine, and in the south of Krasnodar Kray. The soil was frozen and the minimum soil temperatures at winter grain crop tillering node depths were for the most part maintained at minus 2 to minus 4 degrees. On the greater part of the remainder of the European USSR, winter grain crops were under snow cover fluctuating between 5cm and 50cm deep. Minimum soil temperatures at tillering node depths were mainly maintained within the range of minus 3 to minus 8 degrees.

In the northern, northeast central, and northern Volga-Vyatka and Urals areas winter grain crops were still under deep snow cover (50-65 cm and over).

Cold weather prevailed in the majority of the agricultural areas of Siberia and Kazakhstan. Almost everywhere the average air temperature in the 10-day period was 2-6 degrees lower than long-term average figures. Precipitation was either insignificant or there was none at all. In West Siberia the winter grain crops were under snow cover.

In the Central Asian republics the first days of the ten-day period were warmest, with maximum air temperatures of 10-20 degrees. Then it became colder. The greatest amount of precipitation (30-70mm) fell over a large part of the territory of Tajikistan, in southern and in a number of eastern areas of Uzbekistan, as well as places in Kirghizia. As of 10 March snow cover persisted east of a line between Tashkent, Andizhan, Khudzhant, and Kurgan-Tyube. The depth of the snow cover was for the most part 10-30cm.

Scientific

'Automatic Space Station' Launched 31 Mar

LD0104193191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1420 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Apr (TASS)—An 'Almaz-1' automatic space station was launched in the Soviet Union from the Baykonur Cosmodrome on Sunday [31 Mar] by a 'Proton' carrier rocket.

The purpose of the launching is a continuation of research into the surface of the earth and the world's oceans by a radar method of remote control sounding, begun in 1987 on the 'Kosmos-1870' satellite.

The 'Almaz-1' flight program provides for filming of the territory of the Soviet Union and other countries in the interests of geology, cartography, oceanology, ecology, agriculture, as well as the study of the ice situation in high latitudes.

The station has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

maximum distance from the earth's surface [apogee]—280 km

minimum distance from the earth's surface [perigee]—170 km

initial period of revolution—88.7 minutes

orbital inclination—72.7 degrees

The apparatus aboard the station is working normally.

Progress M-7 Docking Difficulties Detailed

PM2903151191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Rebrov report: "Unorthodox Situation in Space"]

[Text] Flight Control Center—It is possible that the word "unorthodox" does not fully describe what happened. There were many worries and a lot of concern. The failure of the Progress M-7 cargo craft to dock with the orbital complex jeopardized the further implementation of the work program. The Progress carries almost 3 tonnes of freight need by the crew currently working in space and those who will continue the experiments and research in orbit—to be specific, the international expedition whose launch is scheduled for 12 May.

The first attempt undertaken 21 March was unsuccessful. The Kurs automated approach and docking system, detecting the discrepancy between the parameters fed into the computer memory and the actual data of the crafts' approach, "refused" to proceed. Something similar recurred 23 March. However, the situation did not develop as some of my colleagues described it. There was no threat of a catastrophe. There was something different.

This is what I want to tell you about. Our attitude toward the professionalism of those who are in charge of the flight and who work in space is sometimes very offhand. An extraordinarily complex situation developed. I will not try to say how many possible options there were. But having assessed the situation, they worked out the likely cause, and then they rehearsed their further steps on the "life-size model."

Cosmonauts V. Afanasyev and M. Manarov undocked the Soyuz TM-11 craft from the orbital complex and circled around it from the direction of the Kvant module. Here too the first attempt failed, but the change to the standby unit ensured the docking. The assumption that the Kvant's antenna had moved was fully vindicated.

All these days and nights were very tense for the flight control specialists and for the designers of the crafts and the station and its modules—in short, for all the ground staff. They were just as stressful for the cosmonauts. It is here that the professionalism of those whom we (yes, I mean all of us) have entrusted with working on this exceptionally complex and expensive space equipment demonstrated itself. Their ability to analyze and find correct solutions was confirmed by the entire course of their further actions.

The flight leadership took the decision to "repeat" the docking of the Progress M-7 (by now third attempt) today, 28 March, at 1505 hours, but approaching on the occasion from the direction of the "port" where the Soyuz TM-11 had hitherto been docked. Naturally, there will be difficulties with unloading and with the transfer of fuel. But these are difficulties of a completely different nature. They are surmountable.

One final clarification. Flight control was only slightly out, the docking took place at 1503 hours.

Military

Gorbachev Addresses Army Party Conference

LD3103204691 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1830 GMT 31 Mar 91

["Abridged version" of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the All-Army Party Conference in Moscow on 30 March]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Mar (TASS)—Here is an abridged version of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the first All-Army Party Conference, which finished in Moscow on 30 March.

Giving greetings to the participants of the conference, and through them to all Army and Navy Communists, M.S. Gorbachev expressed his great appreciation for their position of high responsibility for the destiny of the people, from which the urgent issues of Army life, relations between the Armed Forces and society, and strengthening the country's defense capability and security are being discussed.

The party conference is completing the process of separating the functions of military-political bodies and party organizations, which are acquiring full independence.

The activities of the newly formed party committees, M.S. Gorbachev stressed, must be fully and completely permeated with the spirit of patriotism, of selflessly serving our great multi-ethnic fatherland.

At the same time, the party work in the Army and Navy is a significant element in democratizing the life of servicemen, which makes it possible to raise and discuss issues of the most various kinds in an exacting, open, and comradely way. This is also important in order to take into prompt consideration and solve the issues that have come to a head and not allow negative processes to pile up.

The issue of so-called departyization was discussed at the conference. It was justly referred to as destructive. Indeed, the call for departyization is akin to a similarly destructive orientation toward defederalization, desovietization, decollectivization, and so on.

No unprejudiced person can fail to understand that given the realities of the conditions under which we live, all this would in the final analysis mean the destruction of all units that go to make up statehood, as well as undermining and causing the disintegration of the country's unified Armed Forces.

I certainly do not say, noted M.S. Gorbachev, that the demands that have recently been heard in our country for departyization are at variance with international pacts, legal norms, and with the Paris Charter adopted recently.

Talking of the current situation in the country, M.S. Gorbachev stated: The policy of renewing society is

unalterable. The main directions of policy are being maintained. Policy has also been carefully formulated with regard to fundamental choice, economics, property relations, the renewal of our multinational union state, political reforms, and the spiritual and cultural spheres.

The situation in the country is very tense and carries within it many dangers and threats. But there are also great opportunities that have been opened up by perestroika. They must be protected and used in full. This is the aim of all the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president, the Cabinet of Ministers, and indeed of our party.

We will have to act immediately to implement a minimum program for emerging from the current crisis. This program will be presented by the Cabinet of Ministers and will include measures for political stabilization and strengthening legality and law and order. It will also contain economic measures aimed primarily at preventing any further disintegration in the economy. The minimum program is also to include measures to normalize the consumer market and finance.

The results of the USSR referendum unambiguously indicate that the peoples of our country are in favor of a renewed Union. This makes it possible in the very near future to move the problem of signing a new Union treaty onto the level of practical actions. This is exactly the mood in the majority of republics.

This will put many things into place, first and foremost in relations between the republics and the Union and in the division of powers—it will create a basis for the bodies of power to function, and will remove the problem of the "war of laws." All this is indeed what is necessary for our multi-ethnic state to function effectively, and to ensure that the republics harbor no suspicions about the center, nor the center any with regard to the republics. This will, I think, create the possibility for us to act on the basis of accord, accepting common main values and casting aside any political prejudices.

However, the acute confrontation of political forces is hampering progress toward these goals.

Political struggle, like competition, is in itself a normal phenomenon in general, if it is conducted within a constitutional framework. It is part of political pluralism. From this we should draw conclusions for the party and all its levels. It emerges from this that the CPSU should act in a realistic context, every day and everywhere demonstrating its ability to exert a positive influence on the state of affairs in society, and to facilitate the stabilization and consolidation of society.

The most important thing is to deepen and strengthen living ties with all groups of working people, with all strata of the population. In this way we communists have huge opportunities not only to preserve, but also to strengthen the situation of the ruling party.

But today we have run up against an attempt by opposition forces to destabilize society and to shake, weaken, and even destroy constitutional structures. Furthermore, these antidemocratic actions are being taken using the slogans of the struggle for democracy. The special danger of a certain section of current opposition groups is that in their own political aims they exploit and whip up tension in society at any price, often according to the principle "the worse the better." Their persistent aspiration to "overturn" constitutional structures by non-parliamentary methods makes one wary. Quite refined and often open "work" against the Armed Forces is being done. Some would like to split the Armed Forces along national lines and set commanders and subordinates against each other.

We must also look carefully at the position and role of the Armed Forces in the context of the complex processes that are occurring in the modern world. We have created Armed Forces that guarantee military and strategic parity. That is a real feat by our people. This situation has given rise to the opportunity for talks, and for arriving at a new and active foreign policy and a strengthening in international guarantees for security—and hence at disarmament.

All this has made it possible to move toward a change in the role of the defense sector. This enormous matter is directly linked with the present and future of the state, both internally and externally.

Nobody should doubt that the country's leadership will be thorough in building the Armed Forces. We will not tolerate any underevaluation of the role of the Army.

The state of the Armed Forces, the implementation of military reform, and the equipping of our Army and fleet with modern weaponry are seen as some of the most important issues of state.

Concern for the everyday needs of the defenders of the homeland and their families, for veterans, for the infrastructure of their everyday lives, and for the improvement of their living conditions, is the vital affair of soviets of people's deputies at all levels, of public organizations, and of the entire people. And of course party organizations in the Army and fleet are called upon to show initiative, persistence, and a businesslike approach on all these issues.

Within the framework of our defense doctrine, the Armed Forces must have all they need to reliably guarantee the security of the state and the preservation of peace.

Yazov Speech to All-Army Party Conference

PM0104212191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Apr 91 First Edition pp 1,2

[Unattributed account of speech by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, at

the First All-Army Party Conference in Moscow on 29 March: "At a Turning Point"]

[Text] The all-Army conference marks the Armed Forces party organization's entry into a qualitatively new stage of its life and activity, a crucial and complex stage. The country is at a turning point. In the great work on perestroika and renewal of society it has not been possible to avoid crisis phenomena. Circles masquerading under "democratic" slogans are carrying out destructive activity against the CPSU, against the unity of our Union as a federative state, and against socialism. They feed on the problems the country has encountered on the path of transformations and have lately been aligning themselves increasingly closely with separatist, nationalist, and extremist forces. Their coordinated efforts to upset and weaken the Army and portray it as a conservative, reactionary force, allegedly opposed to the people, have not ceased either.

In these conditions the vanguard role and political and moral authority of our party and the successful conduct of the perestroika policy in all spheres of society, including the defense sphere, depend to a large extent on the cohesion and efficiency of Armed Forces' party organizations—a 1-million-strong detachment of the CPSU.

This makes great demands of Army and Navy Communists. The first one, in my view, is that of bearing proudly the title of member of the CPSU and jealously guarding the Communist's honor and dignity. The Communist's honor and dignity lies in a high degree of professionalism, competence, and responsibility for the job in hand. They lie in moral purity, decency, the ability always to subordinate personal interests to service interests, to those of the state, and in being true to one's word and being resolved to act in accordance with one's beliefs.

A communist's beliefs are links which, as K. Marx said, cannot be broken, without one's own heart being broken. They are the chief weapon, which is feared by those who try to reject Marxism-Leninism, trample in the dirt the memory of generations of dedicated revolutionaries, and discredit communist ideas and the CPSU. Every effort is made to rob us of this weapon: falsification of history, insinuation, slander, direct provocations, coordinated items in a number of media. The conviction of the Army Communists who cement the ranks, their loyalty to the military oath, to the people, and to the homeland aroused the hatred of nationalists, separatists, and extremists of all stripes, who are increasingly resorting to moral and physical terror.

Here is just one example. The Sajudists sentenced Lieutenant Colonel N.V. Astakhov, commander of a unit stationed in Lithuania, to death. His answer was as follows: "They can kill me, but they cannot frighten me, because I am a communist."

The Armed Forces' party organization and our party have plenty of these convinced and spiritually strong and steadfast people.

Unfortunately, one encounters, albeit rarely, other types, whose beliefs, to use V.I. Lenin's expression, are no more deeply rooted than the tips of their tongues. The absence of a central moral and spiritual conviction leads some to dissemble and be time-servers, turns them into political weathercocks, and leads others—such as Kolesnikov, Moiseyenko, Kozlov (Western Group of Forces) to total degeneration under the influence of the desire to get rich, and, as a result, to desertion and treachery. No way can they be called Communists, although they were all members of party organizations and their moral and political degeneration took place for all to see.

The paramount task of Army and Navy party organizations today is to focus their work on instilling communist conviction in party members and showing real concern for the communist's honor and dignity and good name and for strengthening conscious party discipline.

This task is coupled with the task of actively countering attempts to impose on society and the Armed Forces the false notion of the departyization of the Army. These are illegal, unconstitutional attempts. They are being made by forces who will go to any lengths to eject the CPSU from the political arena. But, as is known, there is no such thing as a political vacuum. Clearly, these forces intend to fill it, to establish for themselves a sociopolitical and organizational base in the forces and ensure their own direct political influence on the personnel.

What we have is a struggle for servicemen's minds and hearts. And a very serious struggle, when you consider that the Soviet Armed Forces were and remain a most important guarantor of our statehood, political stability, the security and sovereignty of all components of the federation, and the protection of the Soviet people's socialist choice.

This struggle is developing on the distant approaches to the Army: in legislatures, state and public organizations, schools and higher educational establishments, and the media. It involves activities by destructive forces such as inciting conscripts to evade service, instilling fear of it, encouraging desertion, fostering hatred of officers and scorn for military ritual, things sacred to the military, military traditions, and the cause of the defense of the fatherland.

All this takes place against the backdrop of the creation of a multitude of political parties and groupings claiming the right to operate in the Army and influence its personnel. It is a reality. Army and Navy party organizations must act on it. The guarantee of their effectiveness and of the preservation of their determining role in military collectives is assertive, concerted, and purposeful work among the masses of servicemen, where the tasks of combat readiness and training of the forces are resolved, where the ideas of collectivism and comradeship and principles of social justice are implemented.

But it is important to constantly seek to exercise an ongoing, cautionary party influence on every serviceman, to openly, persuasively, and graphically reveal the true face and antipopular interests of those who call themselves the political opposition to the CPSU and are now trying to form a bloc under the flag of anticommunism, separatism, and nationalism.

The main element in the activity of Army and Navy party organizations is the joint solution, in conjunction with commanders, staffs, and military political organs, of the tasks of combat and mobilization readiness, enhancement of the quality of personnel training, and strengthening of military discipline.

At first glance, not a new task. But the current stage of the development of society and the Armed Forces brings a number of significant features into the solution of this task. They are associated primarily with the military reform, which we are supposed to carry out without reducing the level of combat readiness of the forces and the country's defense capability. The reform affects the futures of hundreds of thousands of servicemen and members of their families. The reduction of the Armed Forces, the withdrawal of forces from East Europe and Mongolia, and other measures that are taking place in the context of it make the solution of social and everyday problems more difficult.

All this obliges the army and navy party organizations to concentrate their activities on express concern for people, for their professional growth and widening of their political and cultural outlook, for the maximum satisfaction of their needs and demands and implementation of state guarantees of their legal and social protection.

Communists cannot stand aloof from the solution of tasks of the troops' mastery of the defensive military doctrine that lies at the root of the reform. When revealing its political essence, determined by the aim of preventing war and repulsing aggression, they have to ensure that the personnel gets a clear understanding of the need for a high degree of vigilance and combat readiness and determined mastery of all kinds of combat actions and all types of weapons and equipment.

It is necessary to give a firm and well argued rebuff to irresponsible statements about the USSR's being in no military danger. This is no more than speculation by politickers trying to satisfy their own ambitions at any price—even by destroying the country's defense system. The events in the Persian Gulf zone bespeak the danger of complacency and abstract pacifism. They confirm that the use of military force to solve international problems is by no means a thing of the past. The same goes for the West's efforts to obtain one-sided advantages in the military sphere, destroy parity, and establish a "new order" in the world in its own interests by using strong-arm diktat.

In these conditions united, highly trained Armed Forces, possessing modern equipment and supported by the

whole people, are the basis of the country's sufficient and reliable defense. They are the bulwark of the security and sovereignty of our whole multinational USSR and of every member republic. The all-Union referendum clearly confirmed that the troops of the Army and Navy are well aware of this.

One of the main demands on Army and Navy party organizations today is the creation and strengthening in them of a healthy atmosphere of party comradeship, mutual exactingness, and responsibility for the common party cause.

In the course of the transformation of political organs into military political organs the army and navy party organizations have acquired autonomy. They have to master new forms and methods of effectively influencing personnel and collaborating with other democratic institutions of the Army and Navy, local party organizations, organs of power, and labor collectives. Only then can party organizations be the truly vanguard, mobilizing force of military collectives.

Great and purposeful work is needed to ensure that all Army and Navy party organizations fit this description. They have strong foundations, roots, and traditions. Our

political opponents' hopes for a mass exodus of communist servicemen from the party have been dashed. Moreover, the party is constantly finding worthy recruits.

But it would be wrong to turn a blind eye to the fact that there are still many passive people in party organizations, who are avoiding involvement in day-to-day work educating people and implementing the party line. Unfortunately, people who faltered and gave in when faced with the difficulties of the political struggle and the social and everyday disorder are continuing to leave the party. Party organizations bear a large part of the blame for being indifferent toward the fate of their members. This position is unacceptable. One has to struggle for communists and for the party.

On completing the reconstruction of party structures in the Armed Forces, we must organize their work in such a way that every communist is an active party fighter.

Every party organization must be a kind of nucleus, uniting and consolidating democratic institutions, the army and navy community, and the entire personnel of the Armed Forces for the purpose of worthily discharging the constitutional duty of defending our fatherland—the USSR.

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Security Chief Warns of Second Coup

PM0104170591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent N. Lashkevich: "State Security Department Warning"]

[Text] V. Zedyalis, the new general director of the Lithuanian Republic state security department, has confirmed rumors of an allegedly imminent [nazrevayushchey] "second attempt" (since 13 January) at a coup d'etat in Lithuania. According to the director, his department has information that if the coup is carried out, different tactics will be used. In particular, the possibility of further armed intervention is not ruled out—but this time intervention not on behalf of some anonymous committee for national salvation, but via the introduction of presidential rule in Lithuania. V. Zedyalis did not, however, give the details of this "Moscow plan," IZVESTIYA's correspondent N. Lashkevich reports.

Officials Preview Soviet-Lithuanian Talks

LD0204105891 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT
2 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—Moscow continues to insist that there should be no prior conditions to negotiations with Lithuania, First Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev said.

Doguzhiyev heads the centre's delegation at negotiations with Lithuania to discuss political, economic and social issues.

"We have withdrawn all our conditions in order to sit down at a negotiating table and try to solve problems," he said in an interview with the weekly PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK (GOVERNMENTAL HERALD).

Since a meeting scheduled for March 24 did not take place, Moscow proposed that negotiations be held between April 4-5, 1991.

Doguzhiyev says that negotiations should be held in Moscow, while groups of experts can work both in Moscow and Vilnius.

Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius believes that in time all disputes between the centre and Lithuania can be settled, including military problems.

"So far there has been no confrontation, but also no mutual understanding. If we fail to get negotiations going, tension will increase and the Lithuanian issue may assume an inter-regional character," Vagnorius said in an interview published in PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK.

He says the republic has been integrated into the Soviet economy to such an extent over the past decade that talks about rolling back its economic relations with the Soviet Union are absurd.

Vagnorius believes that the two sides should first of all promote consultations and map out issues for the first round of talks. He, however, says that "issues relating to army units, which have been holding the TV centre, the TV tower and the radio station in Vilnius, cannot be a subject for negotiations".

As for ethnic minorities, he expressed readiness to submit laws and decrees that have to do with their interests to international organisations for examination. He said these laws will be changed if they violate human rights.

Lithuania Communique on Simenas 'Disappearance'

PM0104151791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Mar 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Lashkevich: "Details About That Night in January"]

[Text] Vilnius—The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has published a communique announcing the official conclusion by the legislative commission especially set up to study the circumstances surrounding the disappearance of the republic's former premier, A. Simenas.

Let me briefly remind readers of the affair's essential details. He was appointed premier of the Lithuanian Republic, replacing K. Prunskiene who had resigned, on the evening of 10 January. His sudden disappearance was announced during the night of 13 January, the night of the tragic events around the television tower. A few hours later, at 0740 hours the next morning, Lithuania's Supreme Soviet, lacking all knowledge of his whereabouts, relieved A. Simenas of his duties as premier and appointed a new premier—Deputy G. Vagnorius—to that post. At approximately 1600 that day, A. Simenas appeared in the hall where the legislature was sitting...

What is the explanation of the almost 13-hour long disappearance of the head of government at such a dramatic time for Lithuania? Why did he not notify the reasons behind his night-time trip to Druskininkai, when all it would have taken would have been a telephone call to members of the government and deputies? What made him give up the services of his official car and set off, together with his family, in "Zhigulis" privately owned by an acquaintance? Why did the personal bodyguard fail to notify his superiors of his trip?..

I will not cite the multitude of stories offered in reply by Lithuanian journalists who investigated this mysterious occurrence. Let me cite only the official explanation of events. "The commission lacks documents to refute A. Simenas' explanation that he had perceived that day's events as a coup d'etat against the Lithuanian Republic's legitimate authorities and embarked on actions which,

should such a coup have occurred, would have enabled him to remain the legitimate representative of power"—this is the rather diplomatic conclusion drawn by the commission's members. The former premier was supposedly acting "with due consideration for the Lithuanian state's interests" of his own accord, without any coercion by anyone. In other words, A. Simenas went into hiding, afraid of possible violent actions by the military against the legitimate head of government.

And so, the A. Simenas "case" appears to have been closed. Nonetheless, many questions still remain unanswered.

Canada's 'De Jure' Recognition of Latvia Cited

*LD0104171191 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT
1 Apr 91*

[Text] Riga April 1 TASS—The Canadian Government has recognised the independence of the Latvian Republic *de jure*, the Latvian News Agency LETA reported today, quoting Canadian Foreign Minister Charles Clark's message to the deputy chairman of the Latvian parliament.

Estonian Komsomol Drops Lenin, Communist Tags

*PM0204141191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 28 mar 91 p 3*

[From unattributed "Komsomol Central Committee teletype" feature]

[Text] The 22d Estonian Lenin Komsomol [Communist Youth League] Congress took place 23 March. Following a stormy discussion, the delegates changed the organization's name, bringing it into line with its internal composition. Now the 25,000-strong youth association of leftist organizations will be called the Estonian Youth League. It was decided that the organization's new name will not prevent it from carrying out all the Estonian Komsomol's obligations. Andrey Gaysin was elected first secretary of the Youth League Central Committee.

RSFSR

Moscow Mayor Urges Lifting Ban on Rallies

*LD0104121791 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT
1 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—Chairman of the Moscow City Council Gavril Popov said that since the Moscow militia is no longer subjugated to the Moscow City Council, he will inquire about setting up "voluntary people's squads" at a meeting of the city council's Presidium today. He also intends to recommend that the city council demand that the country's leadership lift the ban on rallies and demonstrations because the Russian Orthodox Easter is nearing.

The Moscow mayor and his first deputy Sergey Stankevich held a news conference at nine a.m. today in connection with the events of March 28, the opening day of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Many tens of thousands of people supporting Russian parliament President Boris Yeltsin took to the streets that day.

Popov believes that a confrontation between Muscovites and law enforcement bodies was avoided on March 28 because "common sense and restraint on both sides prevailed."

Popov believes, however, "that the central authorities resort to traditional Bolshevik actions," assessing the USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision to ban rallies and demonstrations from March 26 to April 15 and ban a meeting of Democratic Russia movement on March 28.

Popov said that "someone is constantly misinforming the centre about the situation in the city and attitude of Muscovites, which leads to erroneous decisions."

The mayor believes that the following conclusions can be drawn from the March 28 event: The Muscovites are prepared to defend democracy, the mass media, except for several newspapers and central television, have launched a struggle for truth, and the Democratic Movement is turning into a well-organised force that the center will consider.

Text of Gorbachev Decree on Moscow MVD Body

*PM2703140791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1*

[USSR presidential decree dated 26 March: "On the Creation of the USSR MVD Main Administration for the City of Moscow and Moscow Oblast"]

[Text] Proceeding from the need to ensure public order in the USSR capital, the city of Moscow, and guided by points 1 and 2 of Article 127/3 of the USSR Constitution, I resolve:

1. To create the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Main Administration for the City of Moscow and Moscow Oblast on the basis of the Internal Affairs Main Administrations of Moscow City and Oblast Soviet Executive Committees.

2. To appoint Comrade Ivan Fedorovich Shilov USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs and chief of the USSR MVD Main Administration for the City of Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.

The Kremlin, Moscow, 26 March 1991.

Moscow MVD Chief Shilov Interviewed

PM2703141191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[Untitled interview with I.F. Shilov, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs and chief of the USSR MVD Main Administration for the City of Moscow and Moscow Oblast, on 26 March by correspondent V. Reshetnikov; place not given]

[Text] Ivan Fedorovich Shilov met with our correspondent on the day the decree was published and agreed to answer questions "out of respect for IZVESTIYA":

[Shilov] I was born into the family of a USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] worker. That fact largely determined my fate. I began serving in the organs of law and order at the age of 18 as an ordinary staffer of correctional labor establishments. I graduated from Kaliningrad Military School of the USSR MVD. I worked in Khabarovsk Kray, the city of Sovetskaya Gavan, Kemerovo Oblast, and Maritime Kray. I was a criminal investigation detective officer, an investigator, the ministry's chief inspector, chief of the USSR MVD Criminal Investigation Department, and chief of the USSR MVD Main Administration for Moscow Oblast. Then I was appointed deputy minister and, finally, first deputy minister.

[Reshetnikov] What, in your opinion, accounts for the need to abolish the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Main Administration?

[Shilov] It is by no means being abolished. The two administrations—city and oblast—are being merged into one. This is necessary to coordinate efforts in the struggle against violations of law and order.

[Reshetnikov] But many people regard this as an attempt to remove the administration from the control of Moscow City Soviet.

[Shilov] I would not like to get involved in politics. It is my opinion that the decision to combine the two administrations was adopted exclusively for reasons of safeguarding public order. I will add that I, as first deputy minister, will, of course, be able to give the new administration the necessary assistance thanks to the other main administrations.

Russian Referendum, Poll Results Published

PM0104094791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

[Report of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Central Commission "on Holding the Referendums of the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic on the Results of the Voting in the USSR Referendum and on the Outcome of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Referendum"]

[Text] On 25 March 1991 a session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Central Commission on the holding of the USSR and RSFSR referendums was held which announced the results of the voting in the Russian Federation in the USSR referendum and summarized the outcome of the RSFSR referendum.

On the basis of the returns from the republic and district commissions on the results of the voting in the USSR referendum on the question: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of equal republics in which the rights and freedoms of people of all nationalities are fully guaranteed?" the RSFSR Central Commission on the holding of the USSR and RSFSR referendums announces the following figures:

1. Total number of citizens on electoral roll	105,643,364
2. Number of citizens who received ballots	79,993,225
3. Number of citizens who took part in the voting	79,701,169
4. Number of citizens answering "yes"	56,860,783
5. Number of citizens answering "no"	21,030,753
6. Number of ballots deemed invalid	1,809,633

On the basis of the returns from district commissions on the results of the voting in the RSFSR referendum on the question: "Do you consider it necessary to introduce the post of president of the RSFSR to be elected by nationwide vote?" the RSFSR Central Commission on the holding of the USSR and RSFSR referendums has summarized the outcome of the referendum and reports:

1. Total number of citizens on electoral roll	101,776,550
2. Number of citizens who received ballots	76,652,747
3. Number of citizens who took part in the voting	76,425,110
4. Number of citizens answering "yes"	53,385,275
5. Number of citizens answering "no"	21,406,152
6. Number of ballots deemed invalid	1,633,683

When summarizing the results of the RSFSR referendum, the Central Commission did not take into account figures for the North Ossetian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] (North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic) [SSR], the Tatar ASSR (Tatar SSR), the Tuva ASSR, or the Checheno-Ingush ASSR (Checheno-Ingush Republic) on whose territories referendum commissions and organs of state power did not provide citizens with the opportunity to participate in the RSFSR referendum.

The RSFSR Central Commission on holding the USSR and RSFSR referendums has reported that both referendums took place.

In the Union referendum 71.34 percent of those who voted gave an affirmative answer to the question set while in the all-Russian referendum 69.85 percent of citizens who voted gave an affirmative answer.

RSFSR Amends Decision on Retail Prices*LD0204035991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0300 GMT 2 Apr 91*

[Text] Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, has signed a decision on the partial amending of the decision by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers of 20 March 1991 on the reform of retail prices and the protection of the population of the RSFSR. In order to strengthen social support for families while liberalizing retail prices, the RSFSR Council of Ministers has decided to revoke the previously stipulated restrictions relating to the scale of combined income for family members and to establish a whole series of other privileges for families with children.

'State of Emergency' Until 1 Jul in Lipetsk*LD0104084791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 31 Mar 91*

[Text] A state of emergency has been declared in Lipetsk Oblast until 1 July, on the pretext of ensuring the spring sowing campaign is carried out well and in good time. A moratorium has correspondingly been placed for that period upon holding demonstrations and strikes. It is interesting to note that the decision was taken immediately following Lipetsk's first warning strike of public transport workers and following the first meeting of democratic forces. I wonder whether the May Day demonstration, which has for over 70 years now been traditionally organized by the Communist Party, will take place there?

Kuzbass Strike Leader Addresses 29 Mar Congress*PM0104105791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report by I. Demchenko and G. Shipitko: "Russian Congress: B.N. Yeltsin's Report Under Discussion"]

[Excerpts] The four days that the congress has been at work have precisely and unequivocally demonstrated the disposition of political forces. More than enough deputies' time has been spent on this. The congress Presidium's desire to nonetheless find approaches to narrow the gap between positions have for the most part been fruitless. The views of the various deputies' groups on Russia's political and economic makeup have proved too polarized.

It was only at the evening session on 29 March that it proved possible to finalize the agenda for the congress. [passage omitted]

It might be said that some deputies' desire to endlessly discuss various procedural questions sometimes eclipsed common sense. The congress rebuffed an attempt to allow a Kuzbass strike committee representative to speak. But the chairman allowed a Kuzbass strike committee representative to speak, nevertheless.

On behalf of all the striking mining regions of the Russian Federation, V. Golikov put to the congress a proposal that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] should be made—not in words but in practice—a rule-of-law state where full-fledged organs of power operate. Over two years, the speaker said, the miners have become convinced that the Union parliament and government are incapable of extricating the country from the crisis or of granting enterprises real autonomy. In excluding from the agenda the question of establishing the post of president in Russia you are driving yourselves into a blind alley and limiting the strength of your executive power in a situation where analogous forms of such power are no longer operating. V. Golikov concluded his message to the congress with the words: "Assert yourself as Russia, assert yourself as a government, and you will be fulfilling the people's wishes."

The strike committee representative's speech was repeatedly punctuated by noise and did not result in any action being initiated. [passage omitted]

'Confrontation' Marks 30 Mar Congress Debate*PM0104081691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Report on 30 March proceedings of the Extraordinary Third Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies by O. Kuzmina, G. Ovcharenko, and A. Chereshev; and on its 31 March proceedings by Yu. Makhurin, S. Oganyan, and Ye. Sorokin; first two paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction: "Debates With No Time Off"]

[Text] Again, we must remind you: The USSR Ministry of Communications played a cruel trick on the reader. On Sunday, subscribers could not find out what happened at the third day of the Russian congress: Not everyone can stay up watching television until three o'clock in the morning. And then on Monday, only two central newspapers are published, and therefore by no means everyone will find out about yesterday's sitting of the congress. "The Ministry of Communications," writes V. Khomenko from Dnepropetrovsk, "has sharply increased the rates for its services, but is working less well. Will it be possible next year, maybe, to go back to last year's schedule for newspaper publication and delivery?..."

We newspapermen would like to believe that too. But for the time being, let us tell you about the debates that took place on the congress on our days off, which were not days off for the deputies...

Saturday: Dictatorship of Procedure

It looks as if the predictions made by B. Yeltsin on the eve of the congress are beginning to come true: We will chatter for two weeks, he said—and that will be all. Indeed, from the moment of its opening, the Russian legislators' congress has been picking its way through the

thorns of political confrontation, under cover (for decency's sake?) of His Majesty the Procedural Question. This is clear if only from the fact that the third day of the congress began with an appeal that has already become traditional—it is time to start work, at last.

But in spite of this, an unjustifiably heated procedural debate once again flared up over the question of who should be given the floor first—B. Yeltsin, to answer questions, or the speakers delivering the supplementary reports. In the event preference was given to the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet.

Deputy L. Mishustina came to the microphone next. She announced that she had mounted the rostrum on the instructions of the voters, who, in a specially conducted poll, had expressed no confidence in Deputy V. Isakov, one of the notorious "Six" who issued the political statement. The two High Warring Parties at the congress greeted this announcement with little short of howls. You expected rotten tomatoes to start flying from the auditorium at any moment...

Eventually M. Zakharov mounted the rostrum to deliver Saturday's first supplementary report. Once again calling on the congress to be calm and get down to work, he stated that the main questions are covered quite well in B. Yeltsin's report. And that is the result of only nine months' work, and moreover Russia's legislature is barely beginning to become professional. Resolute steps—that is what the congress must take. These steps, in the speaker's opinion, lie in reviewing the existing system of distribution, reducing military expenditure, and consequently reaching a normal level of expenditure. We lost the battle for the budget in principle, M. Zakharov went on. But all the same, we struck a blow against the enemy.

Let us leave the definition of "enemies" to the speaker's conscience. It is evidently another reference to the notorious center, at whose will the republic "is continuing to finance unionwide programs on trust."

In conclusion M. Zakharov rightly noted that as long as people go on "washing old linen," nothing will be achieved. Very true, well put!

V. Isakov, delivering the second supplementary report, began his speech by assessing the successes and failures of the Russian Government and Supreme Soviet in the period under review. He numbered among the successes the choice of a general policy line, the resolution of the most serious questions in the sphere of agrarian policy, and steps toward pluralism of thought and speech. Unfortunately, he noted, all these processes were accompanied by a general deterioration in the situation in the republic and by economic chaos. There is a desire to blame the center for everything, he said, but we must be objective first and foremost about ourselves. National income produced has fallen considerably, the capital construction program has virtually collapsed, and food supplies to the population are "teetering on the brink." He did not agree with the factual side of the case

presented in the report of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet chairman. Compared with 1989, the scale of the decline in production in the RSFSR is, according to his figures, not lower, but three times higher than in a number of other republics, and this is also true, incidentally, of the overall decline in labor productivity. The crisis has hit Russia more than other regions, and the situation should not be embellished. The people are tired of living like this; they no longer trust anyone or anything. Anyone must see, V. Isakov went on, that to a great extent we ourselves have encouraged this, by fighting the center and declaring a "war of laws," followed by the bank war and the budget war, and then unleashing actions along the entire front. We fought the center, but the first casualty, he noted, was the people...

V. Isakov gave an extremely mixed assessment, once again to shouts and noise from the auditorium, of the report read the previous day. He objected to the theme of blaming the center. In his opinion, no clear economic policy can be perceived in the program, either. As for prices policy, the speaker said, here once again there is much talk, plenty of accusations, and the desire to whip up the people's wrath and "bring it down on Satan's head." But who is stopping anyone from coordinating the policy on this matter? Social policy, he went on, is also contradictory and confused. A great many complaints and observations could also be made on the sections dealing with youth and cultural policy and the work of the Supreme Soviet.

At one time, V. Isakov said, B. Yeltsin sharply criticized N. Ryzhkov's government for its inability to complete any of its programs, of which there were a great many. However, the speaker noted, we are seeing the very same thing ourselves. On his election to the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, B. Yeltsin proposed his first program, then a second—the "500 Days" program—followed, then the famous three options, which basically amounted to program number three, and now the fourth. I feel as if I am in a strange kind of theater, he said. The auditorium is full of people, the orchestra is playing the overture, there is applause. But the curtain does not rise, and nothing happens. The orchestra begins a new overture, and again nothing happens. And so on, four times already...

V. Isakov also assessed the congress' work critically. Is it not clear, he said, that attempts to "seize people by the throat" will not produce results, that agreement cannot be reached this way?

The speaker then handed to the presidium, after first reading them out, some proposals on the way out of the crisis situation, by the group of authors of the political statement. In conclusion he reaffirmed that the group is still critical of the activity of the Russian Supreme Soviet chairman, seeing in that activity signs of the desire for unlimited presidential power and the emergence of the threat of a new dictatorship...

...In the time remaining in the afternoon sitting, the floor was granted to speakers M. Zakharov and V. Isakov in turn, for them to answer questions (for 15 minutes each). Then the first to speak in the "debate" was Deputy Yu. Khrulev, after which a "long recess" was declared.

Unfortunately, a two-hour break did not change the character of the congress' work. And although nearly all the speakers touched to some extent on questions of stabilizing the situation in the republic and emerging from the economic crisis, the discussion, in our view, was characterized by political confrontation. Yet it is on questions of Russia's economic development that it is vitally necessary today to find points of contact, and here at least to draw up a common action program.

Sunday: Fists Must Be Unclenched

You would have thought that for Russian deputies—who honor religious holidays and have even made Christmas Day a day off—yesterday [31 March], the last Sunday before Easter [in the Orthodox calendar], known as Palm Sunday, should have been marked by peaceful, restrained discussions. Alas, it was not to be. Only a representative of the Buddhist religion, E. Tsybikzhapov, reminded his "Christian brothers" that it was a special day for them, calling on them to think about the people's good, not political battles.

But this call was a voice crying in the wilderness. Barely had Sunday's sitting begun when B. Yeltsin was granted the floor. No one can break the law and stoop to political campaigning, blackmail, and threats, he said, and he proposed that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet set up a deputies' commission on the points reported from the congress platform the previous day by S. Goryacheva. I categorically deny, the speaker said, all fabrications about me personally. We have had enough provocations and whipping up of hysteria here.

The list of those wishing to speak in the debate swelled to an unprecedented size, but it was decided, in addition, to allow representatives from the deputies' groups to speak. But before that, the deputies decided to formulate a congress resolution on the situation in South Ossetia.

Deputy Yu. Semenov then mounted the rostrum. On behalf of the "Communists of Russia" group, he read a statement. It protests resolutely against "Democratic Russia," whose representatives are constantly emphasizing that the present congress was "foisted" on them. It was not foisted on them, it was convened on legitimate, constitutional grounds. The statement categorically denies that the "Communists of Russia" have no plan of their own for overcoming the crisis. We have our own program, the speaker said, and it is offered to the attention of congress.

Another deputy demanded that B. Yeltsin apologize to S. Goryacheva and the other authors of the "Statement of the Six" for his discourteous attacks on them. G. Belkin, for his part, demanded, on behalf of 51 deputies, that a congress commission be set up on the subject of V.

Isakov's report on violations of financial and staffing discipline by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Deputy A. Makeyev demanded immediate talks between B. Yeltsin and I. Silayev and the striking miners.

Passions reached fever pitch. After the list of speakers had been approved, the debate on the report and supplementary reports began. Unfortunately, the debate showed that political confrontation is continuing at the congress. Nobody will give way. Everyone speaks in the people's name, but fails to get down to the people's real needs. And what about the representatives of the former autonomous formations? Why is their voice not audible in these polemics? After all, 14 out of the 16 former autonomous formations came out against a Russian presidency, as did several oblasts and krays.

The voters can judge the congress atmosphere from the television relays. But some incidents take place off camera. The warring groups do not shrink from unlegislative means, to put it mildly, in pursuit of their political goals. Thus, under the congress' provisional standing orders, all materials can only be distributed by a decision of the secretariat. But forged documents are also circulating. One of these is designed to bring the Communists into disrepute, because it "campaigns" in their name. No sooner had the deputies exposed this "canard" when another appeared: Apparently the "Rossiya" group is a gang of conspirators. This "news" was immediately taken up by KURYER [COURIER]—the congress newspaper—and ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. The "Rossiya" group protested at this attempt to discredit its members in the eyes of deputies and voters.

Meanwhile the debate continued. Deputy M. Kiselev rightly noted that things have already reached the point of a decline in production. But he blamed this entirely on the present Union leadership and the past Russian leadership. What he proposed as an alternative, if palliative, measure was... hyperinflation, accompanied by a package of all kinds of measures. Definitely a case of "the worse things get, the better."

As the sitting continued, deputies, guests, and journalists became increasingly convinced that it was doomed to end in futile confrontation. It was possible to predict unerringly who would say what. The conflicts had well and truly split the congress, and the only time the deputies were unanimous was on the question of full transmission of the debates on television. Though even here there was a political motive too: to show the people your opponent in his true colors.

In general the discussion of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman's report was unproductive and boiled down to mutual accusations and, most unpleasant of all, exposures. Deputy L. Shipovalova, at the beginning of her speech, immediately accused B. Yeltsin of encouraging the miners' strikes, and in effect proposed that he quit the post of leader of the legislature. Another deputy, V. Tikhonov, expressing the fear that society is moving

toward civil war, accused both B. Yeltsin and M. Gorbachev of being unable to rescue the country from the crisis. He was echoed by Deputy R. Abdulatipov. All our troubles stem from the fact that we have a president who can do nothing and a chairman who is not responsible for anything... Yet all the speeches, whatever the speaker's "color," ended in calls to seek consensus. Who will take the first step along that path? Whoever is able, as Deputy S. Filatov put it, to unclench his fists.

The topic of a Russian president was also touched on by USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak, who spoke at the congress. The congress has broken the law by ignoring the people's will on introducing a presidency in Russia, he said. Dwelling on the "500 Days" program, A. Sobchak did not agree with B. Yeltsin's assessment of it. Without the center's support, the Leningrad City Soviet chairman believes, this program will not work, and therefore it is unacceptable. He called for the formulation of a program whose implementation would not depend on union organs. Such a program, oriented toward Russia's internal problems, should be focused on such questions as the national state structure, the reform of local organs of power, the implementation of land reform, and other economic transformations.

The congress adopted a resolution on the situation in South Ossetia.

On Monday the debates on B. Yeltsin's report will continue.

Comparison of Yeltsin 29 Mar Speech to Congress CM3003010791

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1915 GMT on 29 March carries a recording of the speech by Boris Yeltsin to the Extraordinary Third Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies. This has been compared with the Moscow Radio Rossii Russian version published in the 1 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 67-79, and was found to be identical with the following exceptions:

Page 77, column one, last complete paragraph, antepenultimate sentence reads ...done. I think that we will be obliged to devote one of the next congresses of people's deputies to the problems of law reform. These problems must be constantly kept in view by the Supreme Soviet. We must draw up a program for the development of a law-based system in Russia, a clear and succinct document that will strictly bring together the outlines of the bills that we have planned for the next 10 years, and we must immediately embark upon its implementation. At the moment we are drafting laws on the basis of the old republican Constitution, while gradually reforming it. At every step we find ourselves in confrontation with the Constitution of the Union, which is even less in keeping with the ideals of the law-governed state. We are colliding with Union laws that are based on this Constitution and, as a result, we cannot escape from the vicious

circle. We must work on the Constitution of the Russian Federation in a calm and consistent manner, but without procrastination. It must be based solely on the principles of a law-governed state. The new constitution must be completely removed from the sphere of ideology, so that parties that win elections do not have to raise the question every time of amendment of the basic... (supplying passage lost to break in transmission);

Same paragraph, last sentence reads ...people's faith in the law as the embodiment of justice. We shall not succeed in our goal of ensuring that Russia survives and that it revives spiritually if we do not fundamentally change the youth policy of the Russian state. [new graf] Today the young... (supplying indistinct passage);

Page 79, column one, last paragraph, sentence seven reads ...greatest degree of protection and the strongest... (clearing queried word)

RSFSR Congress 31 Mar

Deputies Continue Debate Over Russian Situation

Morning Debate on Yeltsin Report

LD3103080491 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—The extraordinary Russian Congress of People's Deputies, which has been in session in the Kremlin since Thursday, this morning continued to discuss Russian parliament chairman Boris Yeltsin's report on the situation in the republic and ways to pull the country out of the crisis.

The congress's proceedings demonstrate that the positions of its participants are sharply polarised. Representatives from the Democratic Russia Movement, which brought Yeltsin to power, see the reasons behind present difficulties in the "dictatorship of the centre". They insist that the present congress endorse the post of president of the Russian federation and thus bolster Yeltsin's positions in his opposition to the Union authorities.

Opponents of the parliament leader (communists and members of the centrist Rossiya group predominate among them) prove that Yeltsin and his supporters are struggling for power instead of a creative work, what they see as the cause of the deteriorating situation in the republic.

The debate on Yeltsin's report is expected to be completed today.

Deputies' Opposing Views on Report

LD3103120591 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Deputies to the Russian extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, which is in session in Moscow for the fourth day, today continued to discuss Russian parliament chairman Boris Yeltsin's report on the situation in the republic and ways to pull the country out of the crisis.

Speakers are clearly divided into supporters and opponents of the present Russian leadership. Yeltsin's supporters contend that the central government's faulty policy is to blame for the catastrophic situation that has arisen in the largest Union republic.

Deputy Petr Filippov, a journalist from Leningrad, said: "It is necessary that the entire Union government, which by its decisions encourages the totalitarian system, be replaced."

"At point is not opposition between Gorbachev and Yeltsin, but the opposition between the two policies of the economic reform: haphazard reforms and pseudo-reforms, which are being used as a means to preserve the system that had outlived itself, on the one hand, and radical economic reforms, on the other," Filippov believes.

Yeltsin's opponents evaluate the situation differently. They are trying to prove that the reason behind the deteriorating situation in the republic is not in the "diktat of the centre," but in that Yeltsin and his supporters are engaged in the struggle for power instead of a creative work.

Deputy Nikolay Buslov, director of a collective farm, thinks that "the republic's leaders are engulfed by the struggle for power." He proposed that Yeltsin direct his energy into the organisation of food supply to the population instead of the tug-of-war.

Emotions in the conference hall of the congress sometimes reach boiling point. Deputy Erdem Tsybikzhapov, a spiritual leader of the USSR Buddhists, said the congress reminisced a "match of heavyweight wrestlers." "We are punching each other and rejoice," he said bitterly.

The debate on Yeltsin's report continues.

Evening Debate on Yeltsin Report

LD3103184391 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova, Lev Axyonov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—The night session of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies (full parliament) was today devoted to the debate on the key report by Russian parliament President Boris Yeltsin on the political, social and economic situation in the republic.

Legislators Mikhail Chelnokov and Aleksandr Sokolov clashed in their opinions on the report. Chelnokov, representing the Radical Democrats group, pointed to the need to examine the results of the March 17 referendum at the Congress on the Presidency in the Russian Federation.

Sokolov, secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, accusing the Russian leadership of violating the procedure of holding the referendum, put into doubt its results.

Anatoliy Malykhin, a leader of Kuzbass strike committees, told the congress about the demands of striking coal miners. Calling deputies' attention to the difficult situation in the coal industry, he noted that miners also have political demands.

These demands include the resignation of the Soviet president and his cabinet and the transfer of supreme power to the Council of the Federation of Sovereign States.

Another viewpoint was expressed by leader of the Russian Democratic Party Nikolay Travkin, who is also deputy to the all-Union legislature. Rejecting the demand on the president's resignation, he called on the congress to find agreement how to settle economic problems.

Lawmaker Anatoliy Sobchak suggested that the Russian leadership's policy should be reoriented to draft a programme for social and economic changes, which could be pursued, independent of the all-Union leadership.

Colonel-General Dmitriy Volkogonov suggested that deputies should "attempt to make a step towards a compromise." He expressed opinion that a speech by Mikhail Gorbachev in the Russian parliament "would help remove obstacles, which formed between him and the Russian Supreme Soviet (standing parliament)."

He backed Yeltsin's proposal about a "roundtable" of various political forces, since "we have only one way out—cooperation, even if at the phase of rivalry."

The night session was addressed by two members of "the group of the six," who initiated the special congress: Deputy Chairman of the Council of the Republic Aleksandr Veshnyakov and speaker of one of the two chambers of the standing Russian parliament Ramazan Abdulatipov.

Both of them confirmed the criticism of the Russian leadership made before the congress. However, while Veshnyakov reiterated ideas expressed by "the six"

about "the pumping-up of confrontation," Abdulatipov called on the congress to discuss Russia's serious problems.

The congress "has split into those who are for Boris Yeltsin and those who are against," he said. Abdulatipov called on deputies "not to turn the congress into a show aimed at Yeltsin's salvation" and "to save us from additional difficulties."

Associate Professor Nikolay Pavlov of Tyumen, representing the "Russia" centrist group, called on the Russian leadership "to display political realism."

"To implement our economic programme, we demand the resignation of the all-Union leadership and the president. We want legally elected people to bow down.

"If we continue political blackmail, we shall win nothing," he emphasised, calling on the republican leadership to strive for a "historic compromise."

The congress will continue debating Yeltsin's report in the Kremlin tomorrow.

Yeltsin Speaks on 'Blackmail,' 'Threats'

LD3103101791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 0900 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] The morning session of the Extraordinary Third Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies started in the Grand Kremlin Palace today. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin spoke at the sitting and proposed that a special commission be set up to deal with cases of blackmail and threats against Russian people's deputies, in particular against Deputy Goryacheva. It was also proposed that the RSFSR Procuracy be given relevant instructions on this matter. The chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet also stated that he refutes fabrications and slanders against him. It is time to stop engaging in provocations and whipping up hysteria, Yeltsin said.

Discussion of speeches continued for more than a hour. Now the debates have started. The first issue on the agenda is being discussed: the political and socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR and measures to get out of this crisis.

North Ossetian Minister Addresses Congress

LD3103145191 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—The situation in South Ossetia "continues to complicate with each hour," Taimuraz Batagov, deputy interior minister of the North Ossetian autonomous republic, told the Russian extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies today.

He said that "gangs of Georgian extremists are building up efforts to exterminate completely the population of

the South Ossetian autonomous region. Old men, women and children keep dying, whole villages are being destroyed."

The sharp escalation of the inter-ethnic conflict in the region was sparked by the Georgian government's decision late last year to abolish the autonomy of South Ossetia, which is part of Georgia. (North Ossetia is a republic within the Russian Federation).

Georgian parliament leader Zviad Gamasakhurdia alleges that the Russian Federation recognises the abolition of the South Ossetian autonomous region as lawful, Batagov said. In this regard, he called upon the deputies clearly to define the stance of Russia's supreme body of authority.

Deputies adopted a resolution urging the Georgian parliament to restore the status of South Ossetia. The congress asked the higher bodies of authority in Georgia to lift the blockade of South Ossetia and create conditions for the return of refugees.

Russian people's deputies issued an appeal to the Soviet president and the federation council to take urgent measures to normalise the situation in the region.

RSFSR Congress Resolution on South Ossetia

CM0104125291 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in
Russian 2 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Resolution on South Ossetia signed by B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Resolution of Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies

In connection with the tragic events in South Ossetia, the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies:

1. Requests that the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia adopt a decision to restore the status of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast and all the structures of state power.
2. Appeals to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia and the republic's Council of Ministers to lift the blockade; return refugees to previous places of residence; restore the normal operation of the national economic complex of South Ossetia; and stabilize the sociopolitical situation in the region.
3. Proposes that the Georgian Supreme Soviet, striving for the achievement of the quickest possible interethnic concord, release Comrade T.G. Kulumbegov, chairman of the oblast soviet of South Ossetia, and other persons illegally detained.
4. Considers contractual [dogovornykh] agreements between the RSFSR and the Republic of Georgia possible after the practical implementation of Points 1, 2, and 3 of the present decision.

5. Expresses solidarity with the people of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic. The peace and security of this republic, being a part of the RSFSR, are guaranteed by the Russian Federation.

6. Appeals to the USSR president and the USSR Federation Council and demands urgent measures to normalize the situation in South Ossetia and to create the conditions necessary to return refugees to their place of residence.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

Sobchak Addresses RSFSR Congress

LD0104113791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1845 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Speech by Anatoliy Sobchak at Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in Moscow on 31 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies. First of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity given to speak at your congress. There are two preliminary remarks before I switch to the main point of my address—an assessment of the program of those social and economic transformations which the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia apparently should adopt.

The first remark: can a legislative body, I want to ask you, count upon the resolutions and laws adopted by it being implemented, if it itself, ignoring the law and the will of the people, of more than 70 percent of the electorate of Russia, refuses to examine the question of the introduction of a presidency in Russia? [applause]

The second preliminary remark. The second remark: more than 70 years of Soviet power, when the Communist Party of our country enjoyed a monopoly on that power and was able to substitute itself for the state, there have been many untalented leaders of the Communist Party and state. There have been ridiculous situations. But I do not recall an instance of communists even once raising the question of the resignation either of the leadership of the Communist Party or of the leadership of the country. The fact that, six months after the election of the first noncommunist leadership in the history of Russia during the years of Soviet power, the question of its resignation is being raised gives rise all the more so to surprise. [applause]

Now, let me get to the point. I fully support these main positive tenets and assessments which were contained in the report of the leadership of Russia, both of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Council of Ministers, but I would also like to voice right away a certain disagreement with what was said and to speak, first of all, on those questions which, in my view, were not reflected sufficiently in these reports.

First of all, I would like to say, that from my point of view, the assessment by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin of

the 500 Days program is somewhat unrealistic, when he said, several months after that program had been torpedoed, that we are satisfied that there is no other program, nor can there be any other. Well, I think that precisely this is unrealistic because life has shown that the 500 Days program adopted by you will not be implemented, and cannot be implemented, without a change in the position of the Union leadership. Therefore, seemingly, that program, and I think also, the whole policy of the Russian leadership, must be reoriented toward the creation of a program of socioeconomic transformations which it could carry out independently of the policy of the Union leadership and which it could implement in a real way independently of the position adopted by the union leadership on one question or another. [applause] But that means reorientation, first of all, in resolving Russia's internal problems. I would like to name three such programs questions which the Union...the Russian leadership should have resolved, and can still resolve, and which it can resolve independently of the position of the Union leadership.

The first tenet is the question of the national and state structure of Russia. Here, as a member of the Council of the Federation, I would like to tell you the story of how we prepared the federation treaty. The draft of the federation treaty was approved at the Council of the Federation in February and was adopted as a basis. We acknowledged that this draft builds relations in our republic in a very sensible way and that this draft, moreover, may subsequently be placed at the basis of the Union treaty also. Well, how surprised I was, when a month later, having agreed to meet and to introduce some kind of, on the whole secondary remarks into that draft, we suddenly, and not without the assistance of the chairman of the Chamber of Nationalities, discovered that there was no longer any talk at all of a federation treaty and that just one question was being discussed—how should the autonomous republics sign the Union treaty, as part of the Russian delegation or outside it? After having spent a whole day on that, we did not come to any definite conclusion.

I see in this the manifestation of the old principle of the divide and rule policy which has been taken up in our country today. [applause] I think that the task of the congress, in many ways, should boil down to thinking about preserving the unity of Russia, to elaborating a mechanism of mutual relations between the republican leadership and the regional and national and state formations of Russia.

Well, I must reproach Boris Nikolayevich here. I think that insufficient space was dedicated namely to this in his report and not all the "i's" were dotted here because regional bodies of power and especially national and state formations still fear that the whole reform of power in Russia to transfer the functions of power from the Union center to the republican center may come to nothing. We must elaborate a fundamentally new mechanism of mutual relations between the republican centre with the national and territorial formations to prevent

such a suspicion from arising. That depends entirely upon us alone. There is no interference, so to speak, by the reinforced concrete barriers of the center here, nor can there be.

Moreover, I would like to draw the deputies' attention to the extremely dangerous situation that could arise if individual autonomous republics of Russia sign the Union treaty independently, not as part of the Russian delegation, before the federation treaty. A very dangerous legal basis will arise then for raising the question of the disintegration of Russia as an integral state, of leaving the composition of Russia.

The second problem is the question of the system of local bodies of power, the system of local soviets. You know well all the troubles which arise in this sphere. I am sure that the introduction of the presidency will not achieve results unless a radical reform is carried out at the same time as this. The radical reform of the local bodies of power should even forestall that event. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that many republics have already gone through this reform and Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and Belorussia have eliminated the existence of parallel collegiate bodies in the form of presidiums and executive committees, have eliminated that confrontation between various officials, have eliminated the desire to turn local bodies of power into local, village, rayon and other such legislatures.

Therefore, I think that the next most important task which we in Russia should resolve is to radically reform and renew the local bodies, the local bodies of power, is to turn Russia into a truly democratic republic and to adopt a law on local soviets.

Finally, the next question. It is the last enumerated, but perhaps the most important one—the question of economic transformations and, first of all, the question of implementing the land reform.

Unfortunately, while very good resolutions on the revival of the Russian countryside and on carrying out the land reform have been adopted, the necessary steps have not been taken to create a mechanism for turning that land reform from just words into reality.

I think...I am ending...I think that all the economic problems facing Russia will be resolved to a significant extent as soon as we create that mechanism and carry out these transformations.

Last, I would ask the people's deputies of Russia to turn their attention to that document. In my view, there are too many categorical and direct formulas here and therefore, many of these formulas must be departed from when that document is being adopted. I will give just two examples. It speaks of the need to revoke the compulsory nature of state orders and to regulate the economy only through taxes and only through regulation by guarantees.

[Chairman] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich! Anatoliy Aleksandrovich! That's all, finish, finish!

[Sobchak] I'm finishing, Comrades! Just one more minute, if you don't mind. I ask you to heed the need for a clearer and milder exposition of these formulas to allow various forms of economic activity to penetrate our life.

[Chairman] Well, what's this then?

[Sobchak] Finally. I want to reply to Comrade Isakov who in his supplementary report yesterday mentioned my name from this rostrum. And I don't want to reply to or to assess that report in some way. I want to speak of a certain phenomenon which has arisen in our life and which we have come up against in the Union legislature, too. I would call that phenomenon the Golik syndrome. It is when a little-known provincial legal expert holds a high state post...

[Chairman] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich! Anatoliy Aleksandrovich! Finish!

[Sobchak]...and thinks about his career and then the opinion of the electorate and the opinion of the population is just an obstacle for him. I would like us to get rid of such a syndrome! [applause]

Isakov Urges 'Constructive Centrism'

LD3103202591 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT
31 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Council of the Republic Vladimir Isakov said here today that he saw the way out of the crisis situation in the Russian Federation on the road of "constructive centrism."

Together with chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Russian Supreme Soviet (standing parliament) Ramazan Abdulatipov, he met reporters at a congress news conference this evening after the end of today's session.

The two chairmen were among coauthors of "the political statement" by a group of Supreme Soviet leaders, expressing sharp criticism against Russian parliament President Boris Yeltsin.

Describing the work of the forum, the two chairmen expressed dissatisfaction, since, Isakov noted, a victory at any price by one of the two opposing factions would mean only "different sides of the same disaster."

"The congress has not heard an analysis of the situation, we hoped for," Abdulatipov noted. In his opinion, "the most intelligent part of deputies is yielding to the influence of extremist forces."

"We must depart from the extremes," he stressed. "The element of creation should be given top priority."

Isakov had no doubts that the institute of the presidency in Russia would be introduced "but in a cultural way."

Asked whom he sees at the helm of Russia, Isakov said that "it is not the time now to offer names." He expressed confidence at the same time that "there are such people in Russia."

Kuzbass Miners' Representative Speaks at Congress

LD0104015991 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2054 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Remarks by Anatoliy Malykhin, representative of miners' strike committee from Kuzbass, at session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 31 March—recorded]

[Excerpts] Hello, I shall introduce myself—Malykhin, Anatoliy, a member of the interregional [word indistinct] council and of the workers' strike committee of the Independent Miners Trade Union, a shaft-sinker of the [word indistinct] pit. I assure you that this is the very force which is today controlling and coordinating the strike movement. [passage omitted] I would like to say this to you, esteemed people's deputies of Russia. You are all aware that, despite the information famine, the strike movement is broadening in the country to over 200 enterprises. The main reason is that conditions have developed in the coal industry which do not permit us to work and to live. [passage omitted]

On the 29th [of March] the interregional council of empowered representatives met again. These were not [word indistinct], these were the lads whom we trusted from the collectives. We reaffirmed our previous demands. We are demanding to include the question of the demands of the striking miners. It is necessary to examine the following questions.

Our demands are these: the resignation of the USSR president, who does not have a mandate of the confidence of the people and who is waging an offensive against his own people; [applause] the dissolution of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, as having failed to justify the faith of the people. The people's deputies who have maintained a conscience and responsibility should demand that the present composition of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies step down [applause], and the resignation of the USSR Government, which has no specific measures to get out of the crisis. Four: Handing over supreme power from a council to a federation of sovereign states as written by the republics on the (?29th) and adopted by the state. [passage omitted]

We are proposing now, in this emergency situation, to set up an interrepublican legislative commission which, together with us, the interregional council of workers' strike committees of independent miners' trade unions, will work out a method for executing our demands. [passage omitted] We stand by and await your decisions. The strike goes on. Good-bye. [applause]

General Volkogonov Addresses RSFSR Deputies

LD0104161991 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2140 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Speech by Colonel General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov at the Extraordinary Third Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 31 March—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed elected representatives of the Russian Federation: With what pain and sorrow do I look over this hall of enraged people, hostile at one another. We must all, I think, understand what has made us all enemies of one another—I mean enemies in quotes, at any rate—and uncompromising and embittered toward one another, namely the system which is the main cause of the situation that exists today.

The day before yesterday, we heard the Supreme Soviet chairman's report here. I can say in full responsibility that, during the time of Soviet power, there have not been many such honest reports in this hall, particularly in the political sphere. An attempt was made, with alluring completeness, to look into and reveal all the causes of the current critical situation. We have got bogged down in the inextricability of our current situation, finding ourselves in the twilight of that phenomenon which was until recently called perestroika. Many predictions have been made, but I am equally worried to see at meetings on squares in Leningrad or Moscow slogans saying: Down with the CPSU; Put the CPSU on trial; The CPSU is the plague of the 20th century. With the same anguish, I read the lines written or spoken by Ivan Kuzmich [Polozkov] to the effect that, unless the democrats are curbed, they will destroy tens of millions of people. These are phenomena of one and the same order. I should point out that these things are, in fact, evidence that we are all the children of a totalitarian system and are having huge difficulty in shaking off and eradicating from ourselves this spirit of irreconcilability and bitterness.

Let's look at the causes of such a phenomenon. We all look only straight in front of us. Let us consciously also look from beyond the threshold of the next century at our own times. We will most likely look more calmly upon them, if we live that long. The first thing, I think, is that we will be compelled to say that, when regarded from a distance, from the future, our present day is a time of great change, the struggle of two tendencies. One is the tendency toward reforming of a society that is huge, gigantic, and great, but totalitarian. The other tendency is the striving to preserve it, to do only a little external cosmetic tinkering and camouflage, but to ensure that everything remains as before.

Second, looking back from the future, we would be able to say that we are in a transitional period. Any specific individuals, I think, are scarcely to blame for the fact that this period is a very difficult one, but it is within our power to make it less painful.

Third, we must convince ourselves of the fact that we have turned out to be unfitted for the present rapid changes, incapable of coping. The main reason for the hostility among us here, in the hall, the main reason for our inability to cope with changes is that ideological principles rather than economic ones still prevail in our society. We are still proceeding from the idea: Poverty's O.K. as long as we stick to our communist outlook.

There are moments in a revolution when one has to act with the highest degree of wisdom, so that history should not leave us time for failure. In this sense, it seems to me, we absolutely must end the state of permanent waiting. We are in a state of historic torpor: we are always waiting. What will the Union legislature decide? What will the referendum come up with? What will the price rises yield? We are always waiting. But, that is all from the old times, just like we used to wait for the next plenum: What cadre changes will there be? What will this historic, in quotes, plenum decide? We have got used to merely waiting. That means me, too, all of us together, because society made us all like that. It seems to me that in our country, it is only interests that move us all and society as a whole. We are fated to live together, no matter how much we perhaps may not like one another. But, I believe there are opportunities for constructive cooperation between even the most extreme wings, for example the democrats, Democratic Russia, and the Russian Communists. For example, who can today openly put up his hand to say he is against Russia remaining an independent, integral state, a federal integral state? No one, I think, can come straight out against that? Can we really not cooperate on that? We can, and we must! Even if it seems impossible, when it seems there is a huge abyss, we must try to make another step toward compromise.

I recently voiced an idea to someone very close to the president, someone who is in daily contact with him and sees him daily. I will repeat that idea in public, because I told him twice: Why don't you advise Mikhail Sergeyevich to come to the Russian legislature one morning, but without any warning, to ask the legislators and tell them: Representatives of the Russian Federation, let me tell you, and let's talk about what divides us? Why are we on different sides of the political barricade? Such a step on the part of the president, I think, could break down a certain number of the psychological obstacles that have been erected between people of the Russian Federation and the center. I believe this to be extremely important. We managed it during the war: On 22 June, Churchill sent a telegram, and there was an immediate reply, the possibility of cooperation was found. But, that was with Churchill. In our very own country, we cannot find the opportunity to offer one another our hand and make two or three steps toward one another.

We must understand that there is just one way out for us, namely cooperation, even if perhaps in the phase of rivalry, but cooperation. From the point of view of methodology, that means wise reforms, once again

reforms, and yet again reforms, multiplied by our will to carry them out. There is no other way. No.

Our congress here today is, I think, incapable of actually deciding anything. Even before, when we had the previous composition of the Supreme Soviet, I said that congresses in general, both all-Union and republic meetings, are anomalies, and there will be only isolated examples in history before our mandates expire. No one ever resolved anything, even at the Novgorod Veche, when decisions were put forward at that gigantic assembly, everything was discussed the start.

I would like to say a few more words about the following: It was not not only the report we heard here; we also heard the co-rapporteurs. I would like, in particular, to say a few words about the coreport by Vladimir Borisovich Isakov. I will speak here simply as one professor to another, in the case at issue. It was always a tradition among the Russian intelligentsia to fight for and have concern for, in expressing their political views, the moral purity of their position. Isakov, I think, has flouted this tradition of the Russian intelligentsia. I think he was not even troubled by the verdict pronounced upon him by those who elected him.

A great deal has been said here about Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin]. Permit me to talk about this, too, about Boris Nikolayevich. As I understand it, the congress was convened primarily to remove the Russian leadership, and it will come as no surprise to me if someone goes on to put forward a specific proposal on this. We must be ready for this. Yes, Boris Nikolayevich, like every leader, has both positive and negative qualities, but you give me the name of even one leader who has no shortcomings. I know of none such in all history. At the same time, however, he, of course, has weak qualities, in the first place, perhaps, his open ingenuousness, which often rebounds upon him. In speeches, he sometimes says things he later has to disavow. He is sometimes defenselessly trusting toward people. He is, at times, impulsive. But, at the same time, who can deny his courage and boldness? He is, I think, the first to have risen up against the totalitarian system. Who can deny his ability to suffer and endure torment? I will cite an example, for which Boris Nikolayevich will forgive me. The day after he left the party at the congress, I heard him saying in conversation: I didn't sleep a wink all night; It's as if I'd cut off a piece of my heart.

These are the words of someone who could not have invented it; he is capable of anguish and of suffering. These are most important qualities for a leader. At the same time, he can bear the blows of fate. I think that none of us would be capable of bearing such a colossal burden. Take any party newspaper today, there will be five or six articles in a base vein, highlighting various aspects of Boris Nikolayevich's activities.

I, therefore, believe it to be very important for us to bear in mind that the congress has, of course, a specific goal.

I am finishing off now; I have another minute left. I'm coming to the close; there's another minute left.

Trying once again to take, as if history's bird's eye view of our long-suffering land, our Russia, I would like to say this: We have no other option but to gather together a round table and find agreement. There is no choice. Second, we must not evade the issue of a presidency, because we would be disregarding the people, you understand: The people voted in favor. We cannot disregard that. Third, we cannot but cooperate. You recall when Ivan Stepanovich Silayev spoke, the hall fell silent, because he was talking about specific matters. That is what unites us all, because we are waiting for a specific program and specific decisions and actions. Finally, there must be negotiations with the miners, there must be negotiations with the working people. We must not permit the catastrophe of everything coming to a halt, everything stopping. We are mortals: Have faith, history will recall in memoriam to all of us what we have done. But, I would like only to say that there are no rough copies in life. History writes everything down straight away, in a fair copy. Thank you.

Passions 'Flying High' at 31 Mar Session

LD3103205891 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 31 Mar 91

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—The fourth day of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies (full parliament) passed in heated discussions.

Debating the key report by Russian parliament leader Boris Yeltsin on the political, social and economic situation in the Republic, deputies also discussed issues of nationwide importance.

"It is necessary to replace the entire all-Union government supporting the totalitarian system with its decisions," Deputy Pyotr Filippov of Leningrad said. A similar statement was made by Anatoliy Malykhin on behalf of striking miners in the Kuznetsk coal basin.

This demand was opposed by leader of the Russian Democratic Party Nikolay Travkin. Many deputies censured shortcomings in the policy pursued by Yeltsin. Deputy Nina Solodiyakova, a Communist Party official from Siberia, accused him of "striving for dictatorship".

Deputy Aleksandr Sokolov, secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, accusing the Russian leadership of violating the procedure of holding the referendum for the presidency in the Russian Federation, put into doubt its results.

Passions were flying high at the congress meeting. Deputy Erdem Tsybikzhapov, spiritual leader of Soviet Buddhists, compared the congress with a "bout of heavy-weights". "We are bashing each other, rejoicing in this," he said with bitterness.

Colonel-General Dmitriy Volkogonov called on the congress to seek a compromise. He expressed opinion that a

speech by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Russian parliament "would help remove obstacles that formed between him and the Russian Supreme Soviet" (standing parliament).

Tension at the auditorium increased even more when the meeting heard a report on the situation in South Ossetia (an autonomous republic, a member of the Georgian Union Republic).

The situation "is deteriorating there with every passing hour", said Deputy Taimuraz Batagov, deputy interior minister of the North-Ossetian Autonomous Republic.

He called on deputies to hammer out a clear-cut position of the Russian legislature on this issue. The congress decided to take a special decision on this question.

The congress will continue the debate on Yeltsin's report tomorrow.

Moscow TV Coverage of 31 Mar Proceedings

LD3103204591

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1845 GMT on 31 March begins broadcasting a recording of the proceedings at the Extraordinary Third Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies in Moscow on 31 March. First deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairing the session, calls the deputies to order.

At 1847 GMT, RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin speaks. He says no speaker has the right to break the law or indulge in threats or blackmail. He announces that a commission will investigate such incidents.

Khasbulatov then asks why Deputy Andronov left the Secretariat. Andronov replies that yesterday he was with heads of the Secretariat when Boris Isayev, First deputy Supreme Soviet chairman was discussing who would speak. Andronov says the subject of debate should be how to help the people lining up for food.

An unidentified speaker says the Secretariat's work is open. There are no privileges, he says. Andronov's objection is unfair.

Next, a deputy from North Ossetia calls for an end to the internecine warfare in South Ossetia. The deputy calls for a resolution on the issue. Khasbulatov calls for a vote. Voting takes place. The resolution is adopted 901 to 3.

Then Deputy Semenov speaks in support of Yeltsin threats to deputies. A Chelyabinsk deputy then seeks an apology from Yeltsin for a past verbal attack. Another unidentified deputy interrupts to assert that the Magnitogorsk steelworks are on the verge of closing because of a shortage of coke.

Deputies address a variety of provincial issues until 1931 GMT, when Khasbulatov shows a list of five proposed

speakers. Deputies debate and vote on each speaker. All five are approved: Mamayev, Malygin, Sobchak, Travkin, and Sokolov.

Deputies then vote to hear Yenisenko, Chekunov, Andropov of the RSFSR Soyuz group, Isayev, and Kemorov Obkom Chairman Tuleyev and Budget, Planning and Prices Committee Chairman Voronin.

An unidentified deputy says she cannot understand this procedure. Deputy Surkov says he also is baffled by the voting procedure and calls for Sedykh of the Mossovet to be allowed to speak.

Khasbulatov seeks delivery of a report on the situation in Ossetia, after a break. He then calls on Vyatkin, chairman of the mandate commission, who comments on Maley's speech, and then give the floor to Filippov.

Deputy Filippov speaks on behalf of Democratic Russia, accusing Ryzhkov and Pavlov of ruining the market by raising prices. The government is to blame for the collapse of the ruble, he asserts. It is our task to replace this government, he says. He says the confrontation between Gorbachev and Yeltsin is not one between two leaders but between two types of economic reform. He says he fears development of the country on the lines of Romania, and calls for a series of referenda on the future of the country.

Deputy Buslov, a state farm director, criticizes the lack of fiscal and other assistance offered to collective and state farms. Act now before it is too late, he argues.

Deputy Mamayev of the free trade union federation of the RSFSR then says that although his movement is a neutral, it believes that the question of the presidency should be voted on at this congress. He warns against the dangers of not settling the problems of striking miners and steelworkers. He calls for the work for the congress to be concluded as soon as possible.

Deputy Kiselev from Leningrad criticizes measures taken by the republican government, including the 500 Days program, and calls for less socialism.

Khasbulatov announces a 30-minute break at 2041 GMT. When the session resumes, he asks deputies to register for the afternoon session. A total of 782 register, enough for a quorum. He then proposes a vote on broadcasting today's session in full, in view of complaints over way past sessions have been edited. The deputies vote in favor of broadcasting the session.

Komi Deputy Shapovalova takes the floor to continue the discussion of Yeltsin's report. She expresses disappointment with Yeltsin's failure to fulfil promises, and his failure to cooperate with the center. She says she supports Goryacheva.

Malykhin, representing the Kuzbass strike committee, takes the floor. He says the strike movement is expanding, and that more than 200 enterprises are on strike. He criticizes the mining ministry, Kravchenko

and Isakov, to repeated applause. He says he supports real Soviet power and the presidency. He proposes cooperation with a parliamentary commission to study miners' demands.

Tikhonov then takes the floor. He blames the economic and social crisis on both the center and the Russian leadership, saying the 500 Days program was irrelevant. He says the people need to become the real owners of the products of their labor.

Chelnokov complains that the chairman is being unfair to him. He says Gorbachev has achieved the collapse of a rich country, criticizes the Communist views of Isakov, despite his assertion that he has left the party.

Sobchak takes the floor. He asks how the congress can implement its laws if it ignores the will of the people in favor of a presidency. He criticized Communist attempts to remove Yeltsin. He recommends reorientation in the 500 Days program so it can be implemented without central leadership. He also criticizes efforts to get autonomous formation in the Russian Federation to sign the Union treaty as a "divide and rule" tactic. Radical reform of local authority is needed if the presidency is to function properly, he says.

Volkogonov then takes the floor, and praises the honesty and depth of Yeltsin's report. He criticizes the excesses of anticommunists and communists. He says a visit by Gorbachev to the congress would help overcome rifts. He criticizes Isakov, and says Yeltsin's main flaws are excessive openness and honesty. There is no choice but to hold roundtable talks, elect a president, and talk to the miners, he asserts.

Deputy Stepashin reports on a draft resolution on South Ossetia. The deputies vote to adopt the draft.

Kushnarev then speaks on behalf of agrarian unions of Russia. He notes the impoverishment of the countryside, calling for greater attention to this area.

At 2208 GMT, the afternoon session ends with a 30-minute break.

The evening session opens at 2209 GMT, and an unnamed Communist deputy and a deputy from Kaliningrad Oblast speak from the floor with comments on the speeches by Sobchak and Volkogonov. The latter protests attacks on communists by some deputies.

Deputy Shumskiy, a collective farm chairman, says that the people must be provided with more food; he quotes shortfalls in sugarbeet over the past two years. The area for crops has been reduced drastically. We still do not have a specific program to get out of the crisis. And yet Silayev maintains that things are still OK. He criticizes housing conditions in the countryside, and makes general criticism of Yeltsin's report as doing nothing to help improve the economic crisis.

Deputy Travkin, chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia, takes the floor. He believes that Gorbachev's

departure would worsen the situation in the country. We will not get very far if we just talk about removing Yeltsin or Gorbachev; we must tackle the economic issues and find a way out of the crisis. The Democratic Party believes that we have too many soviets. There must be new elections on a multi-party basis. We should elect a president in July. Other elections should be in December. Strikers should be called upon to stop their strike, and in return the congress should promise to introduce the institution of president.

Deputy Kuleshin from Bashkiria refers to the way his area has suffered, as has the rest of the country from the fact that necessary economic changes have not been made, which leaves people without any motivation to work. The resolutions of the second congress have been blocked by the Union government and have not been implemented. The strikes threaten the whole economy. The miners demands are justified. Russia now needs to unite, and if these leaders fail to do this, then they should depart from the scene. He criticizes the fact that programs are prepared by academics, not those actually involved in industry. The view of industry should be listened to. Further, the Russian people have voted for a president, and the Congress should implement this, as a president is needed to successfully implement the necessary economic changes in Russia. Silayev's program arouses fears, and he cites the example of East Germany to show the potential difficulties of the transition to the market. He talks of the fact that certain sections of Russian industry are not ready for this transition. He stresses the need for the participation of the autonomous entities, including Bashkiria.

Deputy Filatov takes the stand next. He says he is satisfied with the report given by the chairman, but stresses that he would like to know why this congress has been called. He criticizes the attacks which were made by the Communists of Russia group during the previous congress, which hindered the work of the congress. The calling of this session, in Filatov's view, was prompted by opposition to the work of the USSR Congress. At this congress it is necessary to tackle important issues, such as the matter of the president. He calls for common sense, but the congress resembles a battlefield. He questions how the leaders of the Communists of Russia group, who are unpopular, can call for the removal of Yeltsin, who enjoys great popularity. He is alarmed by the damage done by these negative actions which were particularly obvious during the preparations for the referendum, when in many areas measures were taken to block these preparations. Filatov further refers to work on land reform. He emphasizes the number of laws they now have to pass and the extra work which this entails. He refers to the need for consolidation.

Deputy Sokolov talks about the preparations for the referendum, the results of which cannot be ignored. He says that the decisions of the first and second congresses should be implemented as should the wishes of the people. Referring to Yeltsin's speech, he talks of the threats facing society such as the threat of civil war. He

criticizes the report for the fact that there is not a concrete plan in it. He says that life is becoming worse, and people want to know why this is. Yeltsin has not answered this. He also condemns the criticism of the communists, and says that the system offered by the democrats does not really differ from the system which existed under the communists. He demands an exact answer to the question about what Russia's role is to be in the future Yeltsin proposes. He criticizes Yeltsin and his supporters for the fact that they are now democrats but were previously communists, and condemns the absurdity of their actions, saying that they need the communists to be their enemies. He calls upon Yeltsin to acknowledge that he can offer nothing constructive, but can only criticize and destroy. He agrees with criticism of the price reform, but says that Yeltsin's plan would only result in a worsening of the situation. Similarly he criticizes his plans for taxation. Referring to the strikes, he says that the center is blamed, but stresses that the economic causes need to be examined. He calls for consolidation. [stirring in hall] He asks whether the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is capable of fulfilling its tasks.

Deputy Rivyakin takes the stand, after Khasbulatov has called for calm in the hall following the speech of Sokolov. A deputy starts to reply to Sokolov's criticism of the democrats, but is cut off. Rivyakin begins by criticizing Sobchak. He goes on to talk about the Army. He reminds the deputies that throughout the history of Russia, the pattern of criticizing what they are leaving behind has repeated itself. He claims that this congress is necessary. The main issue is to find a way out of the crisis, and he cites examples of the bad way that the Union mismanages Russian finances. He considers that the program is good. He mentions the ecological problems which exist in Russia and holds up a letter from Kemerovo deputies and from workers in Astrakhan and says that there are other areas too which should all be declared ecological disaster areas. He says that the central government has done nothing to tackle these issues. He continues on the same theme, giving further examples and he says that Yeltsin should not take all the blame. He asks for the program proposed by the ecology committee to be examined in the spring by the Supreme Soviet. Rivyakin also mentions the matter of the miners' strike and calls for action on this. He states that he is a communist [applause], and then concludes by talking about ecology.

Zaytsev says that those who were nominated this morning should be heard, then an unidentified deputy calls for an end to all this communist rambling. Before hearing the next speaker, a vote is called as to whether to extend the session to hear the next speakers. The result of the vote is 547 for and 295 against.

Deputy Vishnyakov takes the stand and opens by saying that he is disappointed in Yeltsin. He refers to the conflict which is going on between deputies. Instead of working to get out of the economic difficulties, populist measures are being taken and divisions are being exploited. He cites the difficulties facing people in

Arkhangelsk, his own town. He says the Union government is guilty, but so are the Russian deputies. He refers to the failure to adopt measures on a social program, and questions where the money for such a program is to come from. He continues that the need for a renewal of the Union is obvious to everyone, and refers to the commission working on the draft Union treaty. He says that if the chairman would concentrate on seeing this implemented, then it would stand more of a chance, and warns that unless this happens and there is consolidation then the Union will collapse. In addition to the need for a president, there is a need for something to act as a counter-balance to him. To carry out economic reform, strong measures are called for, like the ones proposed in the program, and he says that the sooner these measures are taken the better. He then cites examples of the measures called for and explains why these are necessary to stabilize the situation in the republics. He refers to the two programs which Yeltsin has put forward, and asks him which one he intends to implement; if he cannot decide what to do, then he should resign.

Khasbulatov calls for a half-hour break, as the deputies are tired. There is a 30-minute break in the recording.

Khasbulatov calls upon the deputies to take their seats so that they can be registered. There are 862 deputies, so they are quorate.

Deputy Kopeyko then takes the stand and refers to Goryacheva's accusations of yesterday against him regarding slanderous remarks about her in a program. He calls upon the commission to investigate this matter. A female deputy then proposes that no more people should be heard, as the speakers are repeating each other, and she calls for the issue of the president to be discussed.

Deputy Abdulatipov takes the stand and refers to the political statement which called for the Congress to examine its role. He says his fears that the Congress would be reduced to personalities has been justified. There are no serious discussions, as the only concern is about who is for and who against Yeltsin. He calls upon the two extremes to think of the Russian people. He refers to the hopes associated with glasnost and perestroika for a purification, and says that although the rest of the world has benefitted from it, in Russia these benefits have not been felt. He refers to the spiritual and moral poverty in the country; he says he agrees with the chairman's report in the sense that they need to get away from this. In 1990 and 1991 the USSR reached a level even lower than the one reached during the years of stagnation. He calls for the need to get out of this situation. Referring to history, he says that the country is now the victim of personal ambitions.

Pavlov from Tyumen Oblast takes the floor and speaks for the Rossiya group. Oil production has fallen, and we shall be buying it from Kuwait at this rate. Natural resources of Russia should be in the hands of Russia. The same goes for coal. Conditions for economic reform

include dialogue and coalition of forces. Pavlov says he is not clear what party our chairman belongs to. He supports proposals outlined in Filippov's speech. Marxism-Leninism is doomed, he says.

Deputy Kutsik, a member of the Military Council and of the Northwestern Military District, a KGB official, takes the floor, criticizing the reports of Yeltsin and Silayev in which he could not find any specific proposals for a way out of the economic crisis. He says the prestige of both Yeltsin and Gorbachev is falling in the country. At a time when common sense, wisdom, and balanced thinking are required, all we have heard at this Congress is extremism and anticommunist propaganda. He concludes that the signing of a federation treaty before a vote on the presidency is impermissible.

Deputy Ispravnikov speaks on behalf of a deputy group of nonparty workers. He stresses the importance of the people's faith in those in power, but this seems to be fading. His group support's Yeltsin's appeal to halt political confrontation and find a constructive way out of the situation. The criticisms voiced of the work of the Supreme Soviet are justified, he says. He proposes that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet should work closely with local soviets, and speaks of the need to conclude agreements between the center and Union republics as a compulsory condition to signing a Union treaty. The Supreme Soviet and Government of the RSFSR must work out the mechanism for adopting laws. More work must also be carried out on legislation programs and on taxation. He cites figures of enterprises losing money and their relation to purchase prices, and more figures on reduced stockbreeding yields.

Khasbulatov says he has had a lot of notes from deputies about winding up the debate, puts it to the vote: only three more speakers. The vote is 531 votes for and 281 against—the screen says "not adopted". Khasbulatov wants guidance from deputies how to proceed. The debates continue.

Deputy Solodovnikova from Kamchatka criticizes Yeltsin's report and says she cannot see any improvement in the situation unless the congress can make specific decisions. The market is not all it is cracked up to be, as can be seen from what has happened in Asia and other parts of the world. The legislature and government seem to spend most of the time seeking solutions to the country's problems abroad. She criticizes Yeltsin for supporting the strikers.

Deputy Denisenko from Kemerovo Oblast says there is no alternative to the post of a president of the RSFSR and executive power. This will not lead to dictatorship but to stability. Gorbachev's policy is not only anti-democratic, it is anti-Russian. On 2 April the people of Russia will get another "present" from Gorbachev in the shape of price increases. Denisenko calls for a vote of no confidence in Gorbachev and the Soviet Government and for a roundtable conference; and calls for support for miners' demands on the part of all industrial workers.

Deputy Voronin says that the Russian economy is disintegrating. The government's program is too one-sided to succeed. The main thing which must be done today is to increase discipline in all spheres of the economy. Political pressure on the economy must be lifted. The so-called vertical structure of the economy must be abolished. The banking system must be overhauled and the American model copied. The economy must be more socially-oriented. More attention must be given to agriculture and consumer goods production. Stricter quotas must be imposed on imports. Our investment policy must also be revised. A special republican investment program must be worked out. All these proposals, however, cannot be implemented while there is still confrontation with the center. A conciliation committee should be set up to this end. Voronin calls for a moratorium on strikes.

Deputy (?Graynberg) holds up a paper containing a draft proposal, which includes a section on strikes, calling for deputies' comments by the morning.

Khasbulatov says that 17 women have asked if they can speak and calls for a vote on this. There is no quorum. A woman takes the rostrum for two minutes, says there has been a lot of talk about respect for and attention to women at this congress. She refers to Goryacheva's speech and what she said about persecution. She speaks out for Russian women deputies who have earned the right to represent their people. As she is speaking, many deputies are seen leaving the hall. Khasbulatov calls on her to stop speaking.

Announcements about meetings tomorrow morning by various movements and organizations are made and the recording ends at 0115 GMT.

RSFSR Congress 1 Apr

Moscow TV Coverage Details Proceedings

LD0104202891

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1855 GMT on 1 April carries its regularly scheduled program of recorded highlights from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin on 1 April.

An unidentified announcer opens the program by noting that 921 deputies were registered at the session.

Deputy Zotkina is shown addressing deputies, saying that she likes RSFSR President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's round table idea for the Presidium since it would give Presidium members the chance to clarify their positions and to resign voluntarily if those positions fail to coincide with the majority. She expresses regret over a statement made against Deputy Goryacheva at the 31 March session and calls for authorities to reveal the names of those who signed the statement. She then suggests Goryacheva should be president, to

which deputies laugh and applaud. Zotkina concludes by criticizing men at the helm as being destructive and by calling for a woman to take the helm so that goodness and peace will be brought to the job.

An unidentified woman is then heard from the floor, calling for respect for the people, appealing to RSFSR Prime Minister Ivan Silayev and the RSFSR health minister to correct the health service system, and asking striking miners to heed the needs of the people.

Deputy Kulinova takes the rostrum and criticizes speeches made by deputies at the 31 March session that suggested she is the head of the Democratic Movement, before describing the nature of the Democratic Movement. She then condemns proposals made by Deputies Abdulatipov, Goryacheva, and others on 31 March as not constructive and calls for those deputies to resign, before reiterating that the RSFSR presidency is the main issue.

At 1907 GMT, Deputy Kovalev takes the stand. He expresses support for Deputy Travkin's 31 March proposals on the early election of deputies and discounts the importance of the RSFSR legislative crisis, noting that many countries have encountered such crises. He concludes by pointing out that deputies have taken the liberty of refusing to carry out the will of the people, have talked about compromises, and have regarded dissent as something of which to be proud.

At 1912 GMT, Deputy Bolotov takes the rostrum to read a cable he received asking for help for agro-industrial complex workers and questioning certain points on the agenda.

Deputy Chernyshev follows, criticizing Deputy Kulinova's calls for certain Presidium members to resign. He concludes by calling for discussion on Deputy Voronin's crisis program and for a reading of Deputy Shilov's report on the situation in Moscow.

Deputy Tarasov takes the stand and, on behalf of the Soviet Army, greets miners and calls on them to stand firm in the face of provocations. He then turns to the round table idea, reminding deputies of the results of round tables in Poland, the CSFR, Romania, and other East European nations, and urges deputies to remain vigilant or else they will end up sitting at the same round table with those who destroy things.

Deputy Malkov follows, taking the stand to urge deputies to facilitate urgent, unconditional talks with the striking miners; to suggest continued examination of Voronin's report; and to discourage investigation of the Tarasov case, despite the procurator general's wish.

Deputy Yeremin takes the rostrum. He begins by criticizing the USSR Supreme Soviet for being unable to improve things and by criticizing Yeltsin's report to the congress as being too confrontational at a time when unity is needed. Yeremin calls on Yeltsin to renounce his political ambitions and to focus on tackling economic

issues, adding that preliminary figures indicate that the RSFSR's industrial shortfall in production will amount to between R40 billion and R45 billion in 1991. Yeregin continues, praising Silayev's program. However, he points out that, while the Silayev program addresses the long-term, action is required now. Yeregin concludes by reviewing the country's poor economic state, criticizing Yeltsin's decentralization ideas, and calling for: an end to the war of sovereignties, a Union treaty, laws on local soviets and local self-government, and a resolution to the miners crisis.

After comments by Deputy Yeregin, Deputy Shinkaretskiy takes the stand, saying that although the congress costs R3 million to run, not a kopeck's worth of solutions are found. He describes the lamentable state of the economy and agriculture and calls for the government to spend \$1 billion on farm equipment. Shinkaretskiy concludes by expressing support for Yeltsin's report and for Deputy Travkin's comments on the strikes and by urging communists to refrain from inflaming the situation in the country, to be constructive, and to stop attacking Yeltsin.

Deputy Tuleyev rises to take the rostrum. He criticizes the programs presented by Yeltsin and Silayev and notes that an altogether different program is being worked out in Kuzbass, namely a program to stop the furnaces. He then outlines the consequences of the miners' strike, saying the rank and file will suffer the most. Tuleyev reminds that USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev feels deputies must act constitutionally on the miners' strike and points out that many of those present are guilty of the fact that so many mines are now striking. He assures that he knows Yeltsin wants to help the people and reports that he asked Yeltsin to work with Gorbachev and USSR Prime Minister Pavlov. Tuleyev then calls on Yeltsin to intervene personally in the strike, reviews various local and national problems, and criticizes local papers for calling for the dissolution of all structures and for the organization of strike committees. He concludes by calling on Russian oblasts to define their positions on current processes and by advocating the resignation of the present Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Goryacheva takes the stand to read an announcement on an urgent meeting of the editorial commission.

Next, Nizhegorodskaya Oblast Deputy Makarov rises and takes the stand. He highlights the problems in his region caused by increased inflation and the sad state of the economy. Makarov finds it unfortunate that politics, rather than urgent action, seemed to dominate the congress report and calls for more investment in the social sphere and for urgent financing of the agricultural infrastructure. He concludes by complaining about the sales tax on farm equipment and by warning that the economic crisis will not be overcome until the political crisis is overcome.

Perm Oblast Deputy Kadyrov takes the stand to call for a consensus. He points out that his future does not depend on the Gorbachev-Yeltsin choice but does depend on the people, who will decide the future. Kadyrov calls for a special statement on the miners and proposes the strike be discussed as a separate issue. He criticizes the agricultural situation, the drop in welfare spending, and the severe curtailment of deliveries and supplies, before stressing the need to create appropriate conditions for farms to operate well under market conditions. Kadyrov concludes by rejecting calls for strikes and rallies and by urging deputies to get down to work on appropriate mechanisms to make reform possible.

Deputy Kosovkin takes the rostrum and, on behalf of the Labor Alliance, reiterates the call for the miners strike to be examined separately. He disagrees with Tuleyev's idea that someone called the miners to strike, saying that the miners started the strike themselves, and points out that the miners' problem is a problem for industry as a whole. Kosovkin finds strikes do not lead to anything good, calls on miners to suspend their action, and assures miners that their problems will be examined as part of the issue of the structures of power when discussing the Union treaty. He then expresses unconditional support for the round table idea. Kosovkin, referring to a Labor Alliance plea to the Russian Communists who claim to protect the working people, then confirms the Labor Alliance wants cooperation and not confrontation over labor legislation which has not yet been passed. He concludes by stressing the need to discuss labor legislation which has been ignored by the democrats and Communists alike.

At 2030 GMT, after comments by Deputy Kosovkin, Deputy Goryacheva takes the stand to read a note from Deputy Tikhonov questioning the Congress agenda. Tikhonov then takes the stand and asks for deputies to vote on how many more speakers should be heard. He then proposes that deputies discuss providing Yeltsin with the authority to promise the striking miners that their demands will be met.

Goryacheva calls for a vote on suspending the debates on the first point of the agenda.

Before deputies vote, Deputy Yuganov rises to take the stand. He reminds deputies of the optimism with which they left the previous congress but points out that no progress has been made on implementing the resolutions of that congress. Yuganov reminds deputies of their responsibilities and reads a telegram calling on the deputies to end the country's crisis. He reviews the main issues of the previous conference and finds that bilateral agreements between republics which the Russian leadership drew up since the last congress have yielded no visible benefits, leaving the situation difficult. Yuganov then criticizes republican administrative methods and warns that the situation is worsening. He then turns to the topic of separatist tendencies, focusing on the Baltic republics' territorial claims and on the difficulties involved in setting up customs posts on the borders with

the Baltic republics. Yuganov reminds deputies of the alarm raised in the oblasts bordering the Baltic republics as a result of the agreement drawn up by the Russian leadership with the Baltics. He criticizes the lack of protection for the Russian-speaking population of these republics and concludes by condemning Yeltsin's recent speeches as confrontational.

Goryacheva announces that 388 deputies would like to speak and then calls for a vote on suspending the debates on the first point on the agenda after Deputy Isayev speaks. Deputies vote in favor, 682 for and 197 against.

The unidentified announcer then reports that this is the end of highlights from the morning session and that highlights from the afternoon session will follow.

At 2047 GMT, the announcer notes that 741 deputies attended the afternoon session of the congress.

Deputy Isayev rises to take the stand. He says he has tried to perform his duties conscientiously and has never been in any particular hurry to grab the microphone but finds he can remain silent no more. Isayev says he used to value Yeltsin but now finds him confrontational. He claims that work is pushed into the background and that endless ultimatums are addressed to the center. Isayev warns that the rise in inflation and the decline in the national income will leave no winners if the two are allowed to collide head-on, before criticizing Yeltsin for being too unpredictable and for being inclined to fight and to stage noisy political shows. He stresses the need to channel energy toward creative goals and to fight for Russia's sovereignty, rather than for a regime of power. Isayev finds Yeltsin scores points because of miscalculations at the center, with Yeltsin becoming more popular as life becomes worse. He criticizes Yeltsin's cadre policy, saying selection is based on one's personal devotion to him, and asks: How could he have wanted to replace legitimately elected local authorities with his own plenipotentiaries on the spot? Isayev condemns the policy as not in line with democracy at all and calls for pragmatic action on Russian demands immediately. He reiterates his support for the market and warns that strategy and tactics must be developed for the transition. Isayev urges deputies to worry about the harvest, the next winter, and the strikes, before calling on Yeltsin to appeal to the miners. He warns that the war of laws could lead to wars among peoples and stresses the need to end dual power before anarchy develops. Isayev then calls for a privatization law and a clear plan for the future and reassures that the strength and wisdom of the Russian people will help them find a way out of the situation. He concludes by thanking deputies for their courage in signing the leadership statement, by calling for a no confidence vote on the leadership, and by expressing the need for the moral and political support of the Congress.

At 2102 GMT, Goryacheva takes the stand to announce the end of debate on the first point on the agenda.

Deputy Pyatenkov then rises to take the rostrum. He stresses that the Congress must fulfill the will of the

people and calls for a vote to amend the Constitution so that the president can be elected. Goryacheva interrupts, reminding that deputies have already decided to stick to the approved agenda. She then suggests that the issue be debated after debates on the existing agenda are finished. An unidentified deputy then rises, asking when the issue will be debated and proposing that the congress adopt a statement on the miners' strike.

Deputy Medvedev takes the stand to criticize the way the congress proceedings have been handled, saying Isayev's speech was slanderous and demanding that the issue of the Russian president's office be included on the agenda. Goryacheva interrupts, stressing that deputies are discussing the agenda rather than agenda points. Goryacheva is interrupted by shouts from the floor as she warns deputies to behave. Amid the shouts, Goryacheva calls for a vote of no confidence in her as chairwoman of the proceedings: 371 vote for, 554 vote against, and 38 abstain. Goryacheva then asks deputies to calm down, before announcing that Khasbulatov will take the floor for the report on the national-state structure.

An unidentified deputy rises to ask whether deputies shouldn't deal with amendments to the Constitution. Goryacheva insists standing order cannot be changed, to which another unidentified deputy agrees. Other unidentified deputies criticize these arguments as delaying tactics. One unidentified deputy rises to read cables from factories supporting Yeltsin and presidential elections. Another unidentified deputy calls on Yeltsin to speak, saying Yeltsin should resign if he cannot bring the deputies together.

Deputy Vishnevskiy interrupts, saying his electors are dissatisfied with the proceedings so far, as deputies have been worried about settling personal accounts rather than examining Russia's destiny. He concludes by reporting that a petition is circulating among the deputies to hold another extraordinary congress to debate the issue of Russia's presidency.

Another unidentified deputy then rises and says Goryacheva has no right to comment on speeches by other deputies. If she wants to do that, says the unidentified deputy, she must relinquish her chairmanship and speak as a deputy.

Deputy Ayushiyeve proposes discussing the kind of presidency Russia wants. Goryacheva then calls for a vote on the agenda: 348 vote for changing the agenda, 471 vote against, and 17 abstain. She then reiterates that the agenda now cannot be changed.

After several minutes of shouts between various unidentified deputies, Goryacheva announces a one-hour intermission.

The unidentified announcer then reports that this is the end of highlights from the afternoon session.

The evening highlights begin with Yeltsin, who is now in the chair, calling for the registration system to be

switched on and for deputies to register. A total of 922 deputies register, making this a quorum.

Deputy Novikov, representing the Conciliation Commission, takes the stand to list proposals made by the commission and then to elaborate on them. The first proposal he reads concerns amendments to the Constitution to allow for the presidency. Novikov then goes on to list other proposals, including a proposal to have a two-week interval in the congress. He concludes by speaking about the order in which the proposals will be debated.

At 2142 GMT, Yeltsin calls for a vote on the proposals: Deputies vote in favor, with an overwhelming majority of 8 to 1. Yeltsin then reads a proposal on drafting a law on the presidency.

Deputy Zakharov takes the stand to speak on this proposal. He says deputies must be able to see the text before voting on it, before elaborating on the process of dealing with the proposal. He reiterates that the proposal should be printed and circulated.

Penza Oblast Deputy Klimenkov follows, suggesting that the congress not continue until deputies decide upon which people this congress refers to since it is incomprehensible to determine which people Russian Communists belong.

At 2152 GMT, Yeltsin announces that time is up. An unidentified deputy then calls for a vote on the proposal to speed things up.

Yeltsin then says that there is a meeting of miners collectives and that they are coming to conclusions on this matter.

Another unidentified deputy complains about Goryacheva's handling of the congress, to which Yeltsin replies that it is democratic for the leader to trust his deputy to chair a congress and speaks of the claims of no confidence in the leadership.

Another unidentified deputy addresses the Russian presidency issue, repeating calls for a constitutional amendment on the issue. Another unidentified deputy then asks Yeltsin to speak.

Yeltsin notes that the congress will hopefully end on 2 April, at which time he will speak.

Deputies Makeyev and Romanov criticize the endless debate about the agenda and urge deputies to stick to the approved schedule. Romanov calls for a vote of no confidence in Yeltsin.

Khasbulatov takes the stand to deliver his report. Khasbulatov discusses the draft Russian Federation treaty, the results of the Russian referendum, and the importance of a new Union treaty.

On the draft Russian Federation treaty, Khasbulatov says that it is of huge significance, that it should serve as

an example to other republics, and that it can be easily approved by deputies. He confirms that the federation will be based on treaties voluntarily entered into and that guaranteeing equal rights for all is one of the most difficult issues. Khasbulatov stresses that the delegation of authority must be fixed as soon as possible once the treaty is approved and that the RSFSR needs to preserve its territorial integrity. He says the declarations of independence of republics should be respected and should be put on a federative, treaty-based foundation, before praising the draft treaty and calling for it to be approved within a month of accepting amendments to it. Khasbulatov then warns that the transition to the market economy must be carried out quickly to avoid economic disaster.

On the results of the Russian referendum, Khasbulatov says that accusations that the Presidium interfered in the referendum are unjustified and expresses surprise that there is so much controversy surrounding the Russian referendum when there is no controversy about the Union referendum when the fate of the union depends so much on the fate of the Russian Federation. He then stresses the need to act on the referendum's results and the need for the congress to adopt relevant decrees so that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet can work on them and so that the post of president can be instituted.

On the importance of a new Union treaty, Khasbulatov advises that those who criticize the Russian leadership for not participating in work on the union treaty are those who do not know the real situation, before reviewing events leading up to the Russian Federation's declaration of independence. In reviewing the text of the treaty, Khasbulatov points out that joint areas of competence need to be strictly defined to avoid any arguments, to facilitate the signing of the Union treaty, and to avoid a battle of laws.

Khasbulatov answers deputies' questions. Regarding voting for the presidency in the Russian Federation by the various republics in Russia and whether the actions of the Russian Communist Party are constitutional, Khasbulatov says that they are a constitutional authority. Other questions are put forward, and Khasbulatov asks for more time to reply to them. Khasbulatov replies to questions regarding the Union treaty and the name of the Russian Federation. A deputy asks about the powers of the republics; Khasbulatov says this is not the time for that. A written question inquires into the numbers of the electorate; Khasbulatov says he can have the figures circulated. Deputy Stepanov throws doubt on whether the result of the USSR referendum will be respected. Khasbulatov states that the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be respected.

Khasbulatov answers further questions on the referendum. He explains the powers enjoyed by all the republics according to the federative treaty. He speaks of the constructive proposals regarding interregional ties mentioned in the prime minister's speech, but says that the ethnic minorities are always faced with difficulties.

A deputy asks whether the federative treaty will be signed soon with the involvement of repressed peoples. Khasbulatov answers in the affirmative. Deputy Grachev asks about the joint powers to be enjoyed according to the Union treaty and complains that people have not been acquainted with all the clauses in the treaty. Khasbulatov explains that the autonomous republics need to gain real autonomy and not just that of appearances. He says that at every meeting of heads of Supreme Soviets, none have expressed the desire to secede from Russia. He says that if Russia was to sign the Union treaty in its present state it would be unwise, because it would not form a sound base for economic development of Russia and of a Union state.

A deputy asks Khasbulatov why the Supreme Soviet was more active before the Law on Land was adopted and asks about the complaints made today with regard to the chairing of the congress. Khasbulatov refers to the meeting on the economic plan, and says at that time he suggested that a Russian plan be drawn up, because he did not believe that the central government would adopt the Yavlinskiy plan. Yeltsin was doubtful at the time. Khasbulatov says he would have resigned if he had not been in agreement with the decisions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Yeltsin reminds deputies about electing an auditing commission regarding the draft federative treaty. Deputies make proposals regarding the membership of the commission. Yeltsin asks how the voting should be effected—according to a list or one-by-one. Deputies vote to elect the commission. Yeltsin reads out the names and puts it to the vote; 888 vote for the voting to take place on those mentioned. Yeltsin again discusses the order of voting; another vote is taken on the form of voting. Yeltsin asks for those who wish to speak on the given issue to press their request buttons. There are 287 requests to speak. Yeltsin says time has ended, but there should be a vote on the issue of the presidency. A deputy asks for Deputy Novikov to return and give the exact formulation of his fourth proposal regarding the presidency of the Russian Federation. The deputy says that the results of the referendum must be examined and then the issue included in the agenda. Yeltsin says the central electoral commission has summed up the results of the referendum and that there has already been a vote to vote on these issues.

Yeltsin continues to ask about the voting amidst noise and confusion. He asks the deputies to return to their seats. He gives details of additional points to be added.

Novikov takes the floor again to explain one or two changes made to the proposals and says that there must be revoting on their formulation. Yeltsin requests a vote on the draft amendments to the RSFSR Constitution regarding the RSFSR presidency in keeping with the results of the referendum; 519 are for and 424 against. Regarding the presidency and a decision on the presidency; 472 are for and 458 against.

A deputy says the question is incorrectly formulated. Yeltsin studies the text and questions the fact that part of the text has been left out. He asks for a vote on this, the fourth question; 541 are for the question in its present formulation and 411 against.

At 0002 GMT on 2 April a deputy brings up procedural matters. Deputy Andropov expresses support for Deputy Shakhrai, who says that the period of the elections should be determined and the powers of the president defined. Other deputies express their opinions on these proposals. Novikov requests voting on these procedural matters.

More deputies take the floor regarding voting. Deputy Lokshin on behalf of agrarian representatives favors removing the fourth question. Various deputies continue with further proposals on these matters, stating that there are still so many issues that have to be sorted out. Discussion continues, and the recorded program ends at 0021 GMT.

Congress Continues To Debate Russian Presidency

Adjourns Over Vote Deadlock

LD0104112491 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The session of the extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies was suddenly interrupted today as deputies failed to decide whether or not to include in the agenda discussion of a presidency of the Russian Federation.

Last week, when discussing the agenda of the congress, the majority of deputies spoke out against its inclusion. However, during the three-day discussion about Boris Yeltsin's report, his supporters pressed for reviewing the issue. They argue that the executive presidency would boost Yeltsin's positions in his struggle with Union authorities.

Today after the completion of the debates, deputies—members of the movement "Democratic Russia"—who put Yeltsin into power insisted on taking a vote on whether or not to change the agenda.

Having lost by 348 votes to 471 with 17 abstentions, Yeltsin's supporters began to heckle speakers.

The congress adjourned for two to three hours in a bid to find a way out of the deadlock.

Moscow Radio on 'Stormy Debate'

LD0104123191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Our legislative correspondents report that today the RSFSR Congress continued the debate on Boris Yeltsin's report and on the co-reports. Deputies of democratic orientation supported the main points in the program for surmounting the crisis in the republic, as set

out in Yeltsin's report and Silayev's speech. As on previous days, the Communists of Russia sharply criticized the report. According to deputy Makarov, the report was in the traditions of the years of stagnation.

During the debate on procedural questions, Deputy Zorkina proposed that Svetlana Goryacheva be nominated for the post of president of Russia. Deputy Isayev set out the reasons why he signed the well-known Declaration of Six. On behalf of its sponsors he read a new declaration in which he proposed that the entire Presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet should resign. After a stormy debate on whether to include the question of the presidency on the agenda or not, an interval was called until 1600.

Ways To Resolve Issue Sought

LD0104144291 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—The third extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation ran into a deadlock, after deputies again rejected a proposal to include in the agenda debates about introducing executive presidency in the republic.

According to People's Deputy Alexandr Sokolov, who is also Russian Federation Communist Party Central Committee secretary, "a certain group of deputies has displayed an absence of constructive approaches".

The congress was convened to discuss the political, social and economic situation in Russia, he said. Debates on the issue have ended, and it is high time to pass a decision. Nevertheless, some deputies are trying to thrust forward another issue, which was not included in the agenda, Sokolov said.

Russian Procurator-General Valentin Stepankov, who is also a Russian deputy, said that if people's deputies try to evade the issue of executive presidency, Russian legislation allows a group of deputies to initiate a new congress.

He said it is expedient to suspend the congress for a day or two to allow the Constitutional Commission to discuss possible amendments to the Constitution. "It is unreasonable to avoid discussing the issue," Stepankov said.

Russian Democratic Party leader Nikolay Travkin, who is a people's deputy to the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation, believes that if the congress fails to adopt a principal decision on introducing executive presidency in the republic, there will be grounds for strikes.

After a break, during which a conciliatory commission met, the congress began searching for ways out of the deadlock.

Radio Rossii on 'Impasse'

LD0104142891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] After a 30-minute interval at the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies, the floor was given to Deputy Isayev, who said:

[Begin Isayev recording] What is my disagreement with the policy of Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin]? I should not wish to repeat our political statement; there is no need of that. I shall dwell only on the most important thing. To start with, I was enthusiastic about the activities of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. I assumed that his great experience and authority would be directed toward constructive and creative work toward seeking sensible compromises with the Union government and the president. And to start with, it seemed that that was the policy being followed.

Unfortunately, however, this was a short period. Its place is being taken by confrontation. The entire Russian structure of power is starting to be drawn into this fruitless campaign. Real work is being pushed into the background. The economic work of the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium is being squeezed out by a political struggle and endless ultimata to the center. The vital problems of Russia are being consigned to oblivion, while high-sounding politics for politics' sake is being pushed to the fore. The people have described the current period as a parade of sovereignties, the war of laws, with authority, discipline, and public order absent. The result was not slow to make itself felt. Last year, the national income in Russia fell by 21 billion rubles; the standard of living of people in the Russian Federation declined perceptibly; the only thing to go up was inflation, which leaped by 17.5 percent.

Our persistent attempts to influence Boris Nikolayevich were fruitless. On the contrary, his actions and his conduct became increasingly more unpredictable. More and more frequently the question arose: where will the policy of confrontation lead? What is it that impels our Russian leaders: defense of Russian sovereignty or the struggle for personal ambition and personal power? Everyday work, alas, persuaded me of the latter. I am not, of course, enthusiastic about the position of the center, its strategy and tactics. Its notorious position of maintaining its hold and not letting go is still firmly entrenched in many Union structures of power. And we must wage a determined struggle against that. But the tactics of the struggle can and must be different. No one will win from headlong confrontation. Confrontation is tearing society apart. Our union is finally falling apart. [end recording]

Deputy Isayev accused Boris Yeltsin, the chairman of the Russian legislature, of populism, ambition for personal power, intolerance of other people's opinions, and haste in taking decisions. Deputy Isayev also noted that, in his opinion, no one has refuted any of the theses

from the statement by the six members of the Presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet; and if anyone should resign, it should be the entire Presidium.

The debates on the first question on the agenda ended with this. The deputies once again called for the question of the RSFSR Presidency to be put on the agenda. Deputy Goryacheva, chairing the sitting, declared that the agenda had been set, and all issues outside it would be included in the section on any other business. Another discussion ensued.

After this, Deputy Goryacheva called for a vote of no-confidence in herself as the chair at the congress. The vote resulted in a vote of confidence in her.

A discussion on procedural questions resumed with fresh vigor. As before, it essentially boiled down to whether to include on the agenda the question of the Russian presidency. May I remind you that on the first day, this question was not included on the agenda, and this served as the grounds for the constant polemics at the congress—and not only there. Deputy Goryacheva went on to call a vote on who was in favor of altering the agenda. The majority of deputies voted against. Many deputies rose to their feet, a number of people went up to the rostrum; attempts to give the floor for a speech to Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, were drowned in the noise. The situation could be said to have reached an impasse. An interval was declared at the congress until 1600.

Issue Left Undecided

LD0104181191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, 1 Apr (TASS)—[passage omitted] The question of introducing the institute of the presidency in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and of revising the forum's agenda to this end was raised repeatedly in the course of today's [Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies] session. As a result of voting on several proposals submitted by various political groups, the largest number of votes (541) was collected by the variant of Yeltsin's opponents—of the "Communists of Russia" bloc and the "Rossiya" centrist group—which provides for the examination of the question of the presidency and the reform of the organs of state government at the next congress.

But understanding that many deputies from "Democratic Russia" are in an uncompromising mood and may tomorrow return to the discussion of the problem, the head of the legislature proposed that beginning tomorrow morning, the formula for resolving the question of the presidency in the RSFSR contained in the draft decision should be examined. According to him, "it may suit the majority."

Statements at a news conference today by several representatives of the "Democratic Russia" movement testified to the resolve of Yeltsin's supporters to fight until

victory. Lev Ponomarev, RSFSR people's deputy and member of the Coordinating Council of the "Democratic Russia" movement, said that if the question of the introduction of the post of president in the Russian Federation is not discussed at the present congress, it should cease its work.

Deputies will assemble in the Kremlin tomorrow for the next session.

Khasbulatov Addresses Congress on Union Treaty

LD0104190591 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—First vice-president of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov today delivered a report on the Russian and all-Union treaties and the results of the referendum in the Russian Federation.

He stressed that the draft Russian federative treaty "focuses on the idea of a contractual federation".

According to the reporter, such a treaty will define and stabilise the status of the Russian Federation's members. It presupposes the existence of the Russian Federation on a contractual-constitutional basis. Federation members will be various in their nature.

They will be republics, states (former autonomies), autonomous regions and areas, as well as administrative regions and territories. According to the estimates of the draft's authors, the total number of federation members will amount to 86.

Speaking about the importance of a future treaty, Khasbulatov stressed that "we shall not preserve the Russian Federation without unity and integrity". In his opinion, a delay in this work may "result in disintegration".

He suggested that the draft of a Russian federative treaty should be approved in order "to finalise it within a month and to begin signing" the document.

Turning to the results of the Russian referendum, the reporter said that, as at the all-Union referendum, "citizens displayed high responsibility for the destiny of the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation".

According to Khasbulatov, it was very important that the two referendums were held simultaneously on March 17.

Reminding deputies of the results of the two referendums (71.34 per cent of voters favoured the preservation of the Soviet Union, and 69.85 per cent approved the presidency for the Russian Federation), Khasbulatov noted that the current congress (full parliament) should take a decision instructing the standing parliament to draft a package of appropriate bills.

He described a "new Union treaty" as "extremely important". "But it is even more important how it will

be signed," the reporter continued. Since autonomous republics participated in compiling the draft, the mechanism of signing the document will be very important.

In the opinion of a special commission set up by the Second Russian Congress of People's Deputies in December 1990, Khasbulatov said, it is necessary to form a single Russian state delegation, which will consist of delegations of all republics forming the Russian Federation, and "they will sign a Union treaty directly" as members of a Russian delegation.

The reporter concluded by saying that the Russian parliament leadership "never had a desire to delay the signing of a Union treaty".

Then Khasbulatov replied to legislators' questions. His report will be debated tomorrow.

TASS Interviews Deputy Gocharov on Congress

LD0104155291 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS—During the work of the Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies, which went into its fifth day in the Kremlin today, "not a single constructive proposal on stabilising the crisis in the Russian economy has been put forward", chairman of the Russian Supreme Economic Council told TASS.

Mikhail Bocharov, who is a deputy to both the Soviet and Russian parliaments, said "the congress results will be only negative, causing the population to lose its remaining trust in the deputies".

There is only "political confrontation" at the congress, he says.

Bocharov, who last year ran for the post of Russian prime minister, agrees with the opponents of Boris Yeltsin, who say that the Russian leadership is responsible for the economic crisis in the republic to the same degree as the Union leadership.

"Russia could conduct its policy independently of the centre and be successful. It, quite simply, was duty-bound to do so".

Bocharov believes that in nine months the Russian Government could have achieved a lot in many branches: agriculture, farming, in creating markets for housing and land, in trade and foreign investment. However several programmes of the Russian Government could not be fulfilled because of the "incompetence and lack of professionalism" of those put in charge.

Bocharov said that the Supreme Economic Council jointly with American economists elaborated an economic development programme for Russia and the country as a whole. The programme will be published in

late April. However, he was sure that neither Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov nor his Russian counterpart Ivan Silayev "will accept that programme today".

Caucasus

Georgian Leader Sends Gorbachev Letter on Crisis

LD0104212691 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1854 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] Tbilisi, 1 Apr (TASS)—Georgian Supreme Soviet Chariman Zviad Gamsakhurdia today sent USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev a letter in which he stated that "decisive measures have been taken" by the Republic's leadership to halt the bloodshed in South Ossetia, which is in the grip of interethnic conflict, the Georgian news agency SAKINFORM reports.

The letter responds to the telegram Mikhail Gorbachev sent the head of the Georgian legislature on 30 March in connection with the sharp aggravation of the situation in the town of Tskhinvali and in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast overall. The USSR president proposed "that measures immediately be taken to halt the bloodshed, stop the actions of guerrillas, thwart their plans to seize and destroy population centers, and start talks."

As Zviad Gamsakhurdia affirms in his letter, "thanks to the actions of the republican militia in the town of Tskhinvali and surrounding areas, for a week now relative calm has been established."

Zviad Gamsakhurdia accused the central mass media of "deliberately slanted coverage of the events taking place in Georgia" and expressed the hope that "the leadership of the USSR will refrain from further destabilization of the situation in the said area."

According to data from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, in the vicinity of Tskhinvali yesterday there was intensive gunfire with the use of large caliber machine guns and an anti-aircraft gun.

SAKINFORM agency reports, quoting the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs, that there was no gunfire in Tskhinvali today, but the tension in the town and surrounding area persists.

The USSR Supreme Soviet today recommended that the USSR president introduce a state of emergency throughout the territory of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast by means of the forces of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Reports of Continued Violence in South Ossetia

'Firearms,' 'Rockets' Used

LD0104145391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] The situation in South Ossetia: According to Georgian Interior Ministry press center reports, firearms

were used again on the night of 31 March in Tskhinvali. Georgian militia posts were fired upon by extremists, and rockets were fired at the village of Nikozi in Gori rayon. One villager was killed and two were wounded. There has been no shooting in Tskhinvali today but tension remains in the town and nearby villages.

Shooting in Tskhinvali 31 Mar

AU0104180691 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian
1430 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] The Georgian population of Samachablo [South Ossetia] unanimously voted for Georgian independence on 31 March, which angered Ossetian separatists and extremists. Added to this was the disinformation and blatant incitement which the "Vremya" program and other central media have been carrying for the past few days. On the night of 31 March there was again shooting in Tskhinvali. [Words indistinct] opened fire on Georgian militia posts. From 2300 hours until 0100 hours Ossetian extremists in Tskhinvali fired rockets against [word indistinct] in (?Znauri) rayon. One of the rockets hit a residential building [words indistinct]. One person was killed and [words indistinct] wounded. During the day there have been no [words indistinct], however tension in Tskhinvali [words indistinct] on the whole remains.

Georgians Continue Shelling

LD0104212391 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 1 TASS—The Georgian side on Sunday night continued shelling of Tskhinvali with artillery. Fighters also used heavy machine-guns and grenade-throwers, according to the North Ossetian Interior Ministry.

Shelling focused mainly on densely-populated districts of the city, resulting in numerous wounded civilians. The local hospital lacks medicines, dressing and equipment for surgical operations.

Georgian fighters supported by armoured personnel carriers tried to penetrate the besieged city, but were stopped by Ossetian volunteers. Soviet Interior Ministry troops are practically playing the role of observers, as they have no order to intervene. Additional Georgian armed units are being brought to Tskhinvali along the Znauri Highway.

Further Reportage on Georgian Referendum Voting

Vremya Accused of 'Distortion'

AU0104122991 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian
0200 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] The press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Georgia reports that yesterday

and the day before it was completely peaceful in Tskhinvali and the surrounding villages; there was no firing at all. Colonel Tengiz Epatashvili, commander of Tskhinvali, informed us that from early morning in the Georgian villages in Samachablo and in the Georgia militia posts, the referendum had begun in a peaceful atmosphere. Everyone has unanimously voted for the restoration of Georgia's independence.

Early yesterday, the press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Georgia protested to TASS and to central television over their distortion of the real situation: the previous day, they issued information that 12,000 Georgian "fighters" had surrounded Tskhinvali and had burned and looted all the Ossetian villages. They have been informed once again that for the last 12 days there has been no shooting and not one Ossetian has been killed in Tskhinvali and the surrounding villages. In spite of this, however, in the evening, Vremya again repeated the lies and provocative information of the previous day in order to establish the necessary pretext for President Mikhail Gorbachev to send a letter to Mr. Zviad Gamsakhurdia that contains the same accusations that TASS and central television issued in their disinformation.

Yesterday also, the press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Georgia reported to TASS that the situation in Samachablo was peaceful on 31 March and that the Georgian population had unanimously voted in the referendum for the restoration of Georgia's independence.

'Vast Majority' Favor Independence

LD0104120591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1128 GMT 1 Apr 91

[By TASS special correspondent Igor Gavrtishvili]

[Text] Tbilisi, 1 Apr (TASS)—The vast majority of Georgian voters have advocated the restoration the independence of the Republic of Georgia. These are the first preliminary results of the referendum held here yesterday, at which the voters were called upon to answer the question: "Do you agree to the restoration of Georgia's state independence on the basis of the act of independence of 6 May 1918?"

The Central Electoral Commission has informed this TASS correspondent that the results from half the polling stations are known so far. According to these data, 95.5 percent of the electorate took part in the referendum, of which 99.3 percent responded positively to the question put in the voting paper. So far there are no results from the Abkhaz ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and South Ossetia; however, it is already known that 60 percent of the population of Abkhazia did not take part in the voting.

The Central Electoral Commission also informed this TASS correspondent that the final results of the referendum will be known late this evening.

TASS Reports Results

LD0104204991 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT
1 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Gvritshviliy]

[Text] Tbilisi April 1 TASS—Some 90.5 per cent of the Republic's electorate took part in the March 31 referendum on restoring Georgia's statehood on the basis of its independence act dated May 26, 1918, the Central Referendum Commission reports.

The commission said 98.93 per cent of the vote said "yes" to the Republic's independence.

The referendum was not held in Tskhinvali, Dzhava and Kornisi districts. In Abkhazia, which participated in the March 17 all-Union referendum, some 60 per cent of eligible voters went to the polls and 97.65 of them voted for independence.

According to the commission, no serious violations have been registered during the referendum.

As for elections to local power bodies, held simultaneously with the referendum, their results will be published in a fortnight.

Azerbaijan PF Claims Referendum Irregularities

PM0204143391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Mar 91 Union Edition p 1

[INTERFAX report: "People's Front Reveals All"]

[Text] The figures published by the Azerbaijan People's Front [PF] for the results of the republic 17 March Union referendum seriously contradict official reports on this score. Thus, while the Central Republic Commission announced that there was a 74-percent turnout, the Azerbaijan People's Front puts that figure at no more than 15 percent. This truly significant difference in the results was highlighted at a news conference held at Azerbaijan People's Front headquarters. This organization's leadership holds the opinion that a multitude of procedural violations were overlooked during the referendum in Azerbaijan, INTERFAX reports.

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Speech to Miners Reported

PM2703170391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 91 p 2

[Correspondent V. Komarov account of extracts from Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev's speech at undated meeting with miners in Karaganda under the rubric "Without Commentary": "What Nazarbayev Said..."]

[Text] ...About the Miners' Strike

At first, in 1989, the strike lay heavy on the government and instilled fear. There is no fear now. By destabilizing

the economy we will only make all misfortunes rebound on the miners themselves. Before the spring field work the Ukrainian metallurgical plants, which Kazakhstan supplies with large quantities of coking coal, simply will not dispatch metal. We will wreck the sowing. We will not get grain. And equipment is so far only 80 percent repaired—such a thing has never happened before in the history of Kazakhstan.

To my mind, it is nowhere near enough to double the miners' wages. More must be provided to offset the coming price hike and inflation. But where is this money to be found? The easiest thing is to apply pressure and make others think.

For all the amicability that exists in the West toward our perestroyka, there are powerful forces—believe me, I know—which want to make the Soviet state fall apart without a war, without a shot being fired.

...About the Crisis and the Government

It is unrealistic to transform in 500 days everything that it has taken 73 years to do. But there were stages and a clear-cut sequence in the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy draft, and it was clear to everyone where to go and how. Most importantly, there was a stabilization program.

The president of a republic taken separately cannot curb inflation. Moscow has the economic levers—banks, budget, customs, currency... And the reform can be conducted only within the framework of the whole Union. But I disagree with such impromptu actions by the government. I put a question to Gorbachev and Pavlov: OK, you have exchanged 100-ruble bills and raised wholesale and then retail prices—but what now? Maybe the state has been forced to take unpopular, draconian measures, but let the government say how much people will have to suffer and when an improvement will come about.

It is necessary to form the union government to suit the powers which the republics will give to the center, not to approve the same old ministers as before. Union laws and resolutions will only reign supreme in accordance with these powers delegated to Moscow.

...About the Union Treaty

All the rest is the republics' prerogative. Let the treaty be signed by whoever is ready to do so. This now means nine subjects. What of the other six?

If two-thirds of their citizens vote for secession, let them secede, but in accordance with union law. For people of nonindigenous nationality live there, in the republics, and if they want to leave, it is necessary to make provision for them and construct apartments in other regions. There are also Kazakhstan's investments in the economy and other republics' investments there. It will be necessary to settle accounts.

...About the "Alliance of the Four"

When we felt at the last Congress of People's Deputies that the treaty was going somewhere far, far away, I displayed initiative and went with Comrade Yeltsin to Gorbachev. We said: Here are four powerful republics (Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan), which today have 80 percent of the economic potential. We are ready to sign the treaty. Concern yourself with us, we proposed to Mikhail Sergeyevich. No, he replied, it is necessary to gather everyone together. But how can this be done if they do not even participate in the referendum?

Feeling then that a right-wing offensive had been launched against the republics and sovereignties, we realized that each republic cannot defend itself on its own, and we began to unite. When the Cabinet of Ministers started to be formed without the republics' participation, we accelerated that process of unification. We even wanted to meet and issue our own memorandum. We were concerned that the Federation Council had remained on the sidelines when the government was formed.

...About Yeltsin

Russia will always exist, Kazakhstan will always exist. And, for the sake of future generations, so that they can live amicably and in harmony, I am obliged to do business with the leader of the Russian state and to treat him with proper respect.

But when the leader of such a large state begins to fan great-Russian chauvinism, this is the most terrible thing that can happen in the Soviet Union.

And when he calls for the overthrow of the country's existing constitutional leader and the transfer of power to the Federation Council? Just open the constitution and show me where it states that the Federation Council can take power into its hands and govern. And which of the republics' top leaders would agree to sit in Moscow when each of us has plenty of work to do at home?

Our representatives spent six weeks drawing up the draft Union Treaty in Morozovka, and now Yeltsin says that this draft is no good.

Or this... According to Yeltsin, now there is civil war, now there is not. Now Russia has its own army, now it does not. You know, all this is too vague to be able to feel comfortable next to such a politician. I am now arriving at the firm conclusion that he has decided to bolster his authority, which has been falling since the Baltic events and his scandalous statements, by means of a major scandal. And he has chosen the miners. He needs them to be on continuous strike during the Russian Congress...

And yet... When he criticizes shortcomings, when he proposes a program to find a way out of the crisis, when he struggles for Russia's sovereignty and its laws, I am with him.

...About His Foreign Advisers

People now praise me, now abuse me: Why, they say, did you invite a South Korean professor and a U.S. dean? And Kazakhstan will now be visited by the former prime minister of Singapore, a great specialist in macrostabilization programs in the world, to whom doors are opened by Bush and all the rest... He too has agreed to work with us thanks to the stable situation in Kazakhstan.

It is not for nothing that I am going to South Korea, because they have accumulated amazing experience over 20 years. And, of course, it is not for nothing that I have invited the president of Turkey, for they have filled the market with goods in 10 years there. It is also necessary to go to Vietnam, which we ourselves were teaching just five years ago, but now it intends to help us, the Soviet Union, with currency!

We speak of the market, of privatization. But when you ask how specifically this is to be approached, there is no one to answer. Not a single Soviet academician is able to answer. But these businessmen and scientists, who have themselves created such programs, are able to.

We must now reorganize power to suit the market structure and begin extensive privatization.

Kazakhstan, USSR Ministry Sign Rail Agreement

LD0104185891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Text] The USSR Railways Ministry and the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic government signed an agreement on railway transportation on the republic's territory. The document stresses that, to develop the national economy of the country and all republics, railway transportation must be preserved as a single transportation network with a centralized administration. The agreement stipulates the participation and responsibility of each side in planning transportation, in developing railways in the republic, and on issues of the investment policy, finance, tariffs, material and technical supplies, and others.

Kazakhstan Moves To Improve Food Output

LD2803120591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 27 Mar 91

[By TASS correspondent Konstantin Borodinov]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 27 Mar (TASS)—Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev has issued a decree setting up the legal conditions for the population to provide for their own needs regarding foodstuffs. The document is published in the press today. It envisages initiatives by citizens of the republic to develop the production of basic foodstuffs on private subsidiary plots.

According to statistics released by the Kazakhstan Ministry of Agriculture, the local soviets of people's deputies are to provide nearly a million hectares of land this year

alone, primarily for the residents of towns and workers' settlements, for market-gardening, gardening, rearing animals, and also for farming.

Specialists view the decree as the first stage to the privatization of land. It is expected that the measures that have been undertaken will lead to an additional supply of agricultural products, and will permit a restraint of market prices within the next year or two.

Various Kazakh Legislation Published

Law on Price Formation

914A0492A

For the Kazakh Law on Price Formation published in the 15 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-013, pages 12-13.

Law on Banks, Banking Activities

914A0488A

For the Kazakh Law on Banks and Banking Activities published in the 18 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-013, pages 13-21.

Legislation on Ownership

914A0478A

For the Kazakh Legislation on Ownership published in the 8 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-013, pages 21-26.

Law on Freedom of Economic Activity

914A0486A

For the Kazakh Law on Freedom of Economic Activity published in the 15 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-014, pages 25-29.

Draft Law on Enterprise Taxation

914A0470A

For the Kazakh Draft Law on Enterprise Taxation published in the 4 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-014, pages 29-41.

Uzbekistan Abolishes Tax on Essential Goods

LD2903120891 *Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Mar 91*

[Text] The Council of Ministers of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic has adopted a decision abolishing on the republic's territory the 5 percent tax on the sale of essential foodstuffs and industrial goods. This has been done in order to provide social protection for the population.

Among the goods on which no tax is being levied are bread and baked goods, groats, macaroni products, vegetable oil and butter, milk, meat, and foodstuffs made from them, and eggs and sugar.

Included in this list are also synthetic detergents, soap, babyfood and cotton fabrics.